

Biblical Humanism and Scholasticism
in the Age of Erasmus

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM

Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition

A series of handbooks and reference works
on the intellectual and religious life of Europe,
500–1700

VOLUME 9

Biblical Humanism and Scholasticism in the Age of Erasmus

Edited by
Erika Rummel



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON

2008

Cover illustration: Title page of *Novum Testamentum omne multo quam antehac diligentius ab Erasmo Roterodamo recognitum, emendatum ac translatum*. Edited, translated, and annotated by Desiderius Erasmus. Basel: Johannes Froben, 1519 (call number Knox F 00042). Courtesy of the Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, University of Toronto

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Biblical humanism and scholasticism in the age of Erasmus / edited by Erika Rummel.

p. cm. — (Brill's companions to the Christian tradition, ISSN 1871-6377 ; v. 9)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-90-04-14573-3 (hardback : alk. paper) 1. Bible—Criticism, interpretation, etc.—History—16th century. 2. Christianity and religious humanism. 3. Erasmus, Desiderius, d. 1536. 4. Scholasticism. I. Rummel, Erika, 1942-

BS511.3.B54 2008

220.609'031—dc22

2008009472

ISSN 1871-6377

ISBN 978 90 04 14573 3

Copyright 2008 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Hoteli Publishing,
IDC Publishers, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.

Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

List of Abbreviations	vii
Introduction	1
<i>Erika Rummel</i>	
Criticism of Biblical Humanists in Quattrocento Italy	15
<i>John Monfasani</i>	
Erasmus, the Intellectuals, and the Reuchlin Affair	39
<i>Daniel Ménager</i>	

THE REACTION AGAINST BIBLICAL HUMANISM IN SPAIN

Antonio Nebrija's Biblical Scholarship	57
<i>Carlos del Valle Rodríguez</i>	
Anti-Erasmianism in Spain	73
<i>Alejandro Coroleu</i>	
Vives and the Pseudodialecticians	93
<i>Charles Fantazzi</i>	

THE FACULTY OF THEOLOGY AT PARIS AND THE 'THEOLOGIZING HUMANISTS'

Attacks on the Biblical Humanism of Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples	117
<i>Guy Bedouelle</i>	
Noël Beda and the Defense of the Tradition	143
<i>James K. Farge</i>	

THE CAMPAIGN AGAINST BIBLICAL HUMANISTS
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF LEUVEN

Martin Dorp and Edward Lee	167
<i>Cecilia Asso</i>	
Leuven Theologians as Opponents of Erasmus and of Humanistic Theology	197
<i>Marcel Gielis</i>	
Frans Titelmans, the Congregation of Montaigu, and Biblical Scholarship	215
<i>Paolo Sartori</i>	

CRITICS OF BIBLICAL HUMANISM IN
SIXTEENTH-CENTURY ITALY

Italian Biblical Humanism and the Papacy, 1515–1535	227
<i>Paul F. Grendler</i>	
Alberto Pio's Defense of Scholastic Theology	277
<i>Nelson H. Minnich</i>	
Emending and Defending the Vulgate Old Testament: Agostino Steuco's Quarrel with Erasmus	297
<i>Ronald K. Delph</i>	
Bibliography	319
Index	329

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

- Allen *Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami*. Eds. Percy S. Allen et al. Oxford: Clarendon, 1906–58. 11 vols. and index.
- ASD *Opera omnia Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami*. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 1969–.
- AST *Analecta Sacra Tarraconensia*.
- BNM Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid.
- CCCM *Corpus Christianorum: Continuatio medievalis*. Turnhout: Brepols, 1966–.
- CEBR *Contemporaries of Erasmus: A Biographical Register of the Renaissance and Reformation*. Eds. Peter G. Bietenholz and Thomas B. Deutscher. Toronto, Buffalo and London: University of Toronto Press, 1985–1987. 3 vols.
- CWE *The Collected Works of Erasmus*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1969–.
- LB Desiderius Erasmus. *Opera Omnia*. Ed. Jean Le Clerc. Louvain, 1703–06. 10 vols.
- PG *Patrologiae cursus completus... series graeca*. Ed. Jacques-Paul Migne. 161 vols.
- PL *Patrologiae cursus completus... series latina*. Ed. Jacques-Paul Migne. 221 vols.
- TQ Antonio Nebrija, *Tertia Quinquagena*. Alcalà, 1516.

INTRODUCTION

SCHOLASTICISM AND BIBLICAL HUMANISM IN EARLY MODERN EUROPE

Erika Rummel

Throughout the Middle Ages dialectical disputation was the dominant academic method of inquiry. Built on Aristotelian logic and the summaries and commentaries of medieval exegetes, dialectic was the mainstay of the scholastic system. This habit of mind was challenged in quattrocento Italy by scholars using philological and historical methods in the study of classical texts. For some time the two approaches existed side by side. The dialectic method and its scholastic practitioners continued to dominate the universities, while humanists (as the enthusiasts of classical literature came to be called) operated mainly outside academic institutions and eventually began to exert influence through the new medium of the printing press.

The humanistic method was advocated in prefaces accompanying editions of classical texts and discussed in that quintessential humanistic expedient, the personal letter. Letters served as links among members of the humanistic republic of letters and allowed them to form a network of communication. Published in collections, these missives reached an even broader audience. Programmatic pieces advancing the cause of humanism and the New Learning included Petrarch's prototype attack on the Aristotelians in his epistle *On His Own Ignorance* (1368); Salutati's defence of classical pagan literature in his letter to Giovanni da Samminiato (1405); the epistolary exchange between Giovanni Pico della Mirandola and Ermolao Barbaro on the respective merits of rhetoric and philosophy (1485); Erasmus' *Ratio theologiae*, which first appeared among the prefatory material to his New Testament edition (1516); and Philip Melancthon's inaugural speech at the University of Wittenberg (1518). The last two texts promote the study of languages as gateways to an understanding of Scripture. In these pieces the authors commented on the issues that were of principal importance to humanists: their preference for rhetoric over logic, their emphasis on philology and language studies, the call for a return to the classical and biblical

sources, and their disdain for the scholastics whom they characterized as barbarian logic-choppers.

Early polemics between the representatives of the two movements—humanism and scholasticism—were often cast in the form of open letters or dialogues, genres reflecting the literary character of the debate at the time. The controversy entered a new phase when humanists began to apply philological methods to the scriptural text. The debate shed its literary image at that point and developed the characteristics of a formal polemic. The exchanges were labeled “*apologiae*,” adopted an adversarial tone, and were increasingly devoid of literary embellishments.

Biblical studies had traditionally been the bailiwick of academic theologians, who therefore regarded humanists as trespassers on their professional turf. In their view, philologically trained scholars did not have the necessary qualifications to engage in biblical studies and were likely to introduce doctrinal error. Indeed, the more conservative elements among the theologians regarded any attempt to revise the received text as sacrilege and protested the idea of subjecting the divinely inspired biblical authors to literary and textual criticism. Humanists, by contrast, asserted that a correct reading of the Bible was in the first instance a philological task and therefore within their capacity. Conversely, a lack of language training hampered biblical exegesis. This phase in the humanist-scholastic debate is central to the present collection of essays, which focuses on the activities of biblical humanists and their polemics with traditional scholastic theologians.

In the first chapter, “Criticism of Biblical Humanists in Quattrocento Italy,” John Monfasani deals with the scriptural studies of Lorenzo Valla, Giannozzo Manetti, and Giovanni Pico della Mirandola. The three scholars approached the field in characteristic humanistic fashion by consulting the sources: collating Greek and Latin manuscripts, offering new biblical translations, and studying early patristic and Hebrew commentators. This approach attracted criticism and, indeed, the attention of the inquisitors in spite of the fact that Valla and Manetti enjoyed the patronage of Pope Nicholas V and that critical reviews of the received text were not unprecedented. Medieval theologians recognized that mistakes had crept into the Vulgate text and listed them in so-called *correctoria*. These were, however, concerned only with textual corruptions, whereas Renaissance humanists wanted to correct and improve the translation as well. In that process they could not help but touch on the meaning and interpretation of the text. Their engagement with the sources and the early commentators—Christian or Jewish—laid

the groundwork for the transformation biblical studies underwent in the sixteenth century. They also foreshadowed the controversies of the sixteenth century when the debate about biblical studies moved north and entered the halls of academe. It was Erasmus who linked the efforts of the two generations by publishing Valla's annotations on the gospels in 1505 and defending the humanistic foray into biblical studies in an apologetic preface.

What had begun as a literary debate turned into a turf war between members of the faculties of Arts and Theology at northern universities. The polemics ranged from debates over curriculum and academic qualifications to questions of authority and competence. Humanists wanted to see a more prominent place accorded to language studies in the curriculum. They justified their campaign on the basis of the principle *Ad fontes*, claiming that source texts were superior to summaries and commentaries and must be read in the original language.

In the second chapter, Daniel Ménager discusses one of the earliest polemics north of the Alps: the complex case of the Hebraist Johann Reuchlin. One of the main issues in this controversy was the value of Hebrew literature for Christian scholars. Indeed Reuchlin's defence of Hebrew studies landed him in the inquisitorial court and earned him a charge of Judaism. However, the dispute also involved methodological questions and in that sense comes under the heading of a humanist-scholastic debate. Reuchlin, a jurist by profession who also taught in the faculty of arts at Tübingen, accused the theologians of ignorance. He was convinced that a lack of training in biblical languages and the resulting inability to study the sources had led theologians into erroneous interpretations. His insistence that Jewish texts be preserved and used in the Jewish-Christian dialogue reflect humanistic priorities, that is, an appreciation of source texts over dialectical argumentation.

In his essay "Erasmus, the Intellectuals, and the Reuchlin Affair" Ménager examines the strategies used by the two parties in the dispute. The scholastic theologians, relying on their colleague, the inquisitor Jacob Hoogstraten, used ecclesiastical law to force Reuchlin into submission. The humanists applied the power of persuasion to sway public opinion through what might well be the first letter writing campaign and a striking case of professional networking.

The question of orthodoxy, an issue raised in the Reuchlin controversy, was to dominate the next phase of the polemics between biblical humanists and theologians, a phase marked by the rise of Luther and the progress of the Reformation. From the 1520s on, theologians

challenged the activity of biblical humanists not only on methodological but increasingly on doctrinal grounds. They accused the humanists of inspiring the Lutheran reformation. Indeed Luther himself contributed to this impression by repeatedly placing himself in a humanistic lineup, citing Valla, Pico, and Erasmus as fellow victims of a censorious establishment.¹ The polemics of the 1520s and 1530s thus reflected both the religious debate, which gripped Europe at the time, and the debate over the merits of the New Learning. Erasmus, advancing a conspiracy theory, claimed that scholastic theologians were trying to link humanism with the Reformation to tar both movements with the brush of heresy.² Although it was naïve and possibly malicious to claim that humanism inspired the Reformation, a certain connection between the two movements was undeniable. The reformers used the historical and philological methods pioneered by humanists to underpin their doctrinal positions; and the Lutheran emphasis on Scripture could justifiably be called an extension of the humanistic slogan *Ad fontes*.

Although the development of the humanist-scholastic polemics follows a chronological line, that is, although it could be seen as unfolding in three consecutive phases—literary, academic, and doctrinal—there are also geographical differences reflecting specific socio-political conditions. The third to sixth chapters therefore take a separate look at the developments in Spain, France, the Netherlands, and Italy.

The section, “The Reaction against Biblical Humanism in Spain,” begins with Carlos del Valle Rodríguez’ discussion of Elio Nebrija’s contribution to bible studies. After absorbing the principles of the New Learning during his travels in Italy, Nebrija introduced humanistic ideas in Spain. He became the country’s foremost grammarian, but when he turned his philological skills to Old Testament texts, his manuscripts were confiscated by the Inquisitor General. Although he was rescued by Cardinal Jiménez de Cisneros and invited to collaborate on his great project, the edition of the Complutensian Polyglot, Nebrija was unable to make the humanistic method palatable to his patron or to the theologians on his team. Nebrija had been engaged to look after the Hebrew text, but he resigned from the project when he found Cisneros unwilling to allow corrections or revisions of the Latin Vulgate

¹ *D. Martin Luthers Werke* I (Weimar, 1930), p. 574; *ibid.* VI, pp. 184–85.

² See Erika Rummel, *The Confessionalization of Humanism in Reformation Germany* (New York, 2000), pp. 22–29.

on the basis of the Hebrew text. The Cardinal preferred to keep the language traditions separate and to present them in parallel columns. Such deference to the *textus receptus* was one of the principal reasons for the tensions between theologians and biblical humanists. It was based on the belief that St. Jerome was the author of the Vulgate and that both the original biblical authors and the translator had written under divine guidance.

While the Polyglot was awaiting the papal imprimatur, Erasmus' bilingual edition of the New Testament was published by Johann Froben in Basel (1516). It thus became the *editio princeps* of the Greek text. Not surprisingly, Erasmus' annotations on the text, explaining his editorial decisions, met with a critical reception. In subsequent editions (1519, 1522, 1527, 1535) he incorporated responses to his critics, without naming them, and added many citations from patristic texts to give weight to his corrections and reinterpretations.

The reaction of Spanish critics is discussed in Alejandro Coroleu's essay, "Anti-Erasmianism in Spain." The Spanish theologians saw Erasmus' annotations on the biblical text not only as irreverent but also as doctrinally questionable. Diego López Zúñiga, a contributor to the Polyglot, subjected Erasmus' New Testament edition to a detailed review, but he was discouraged from publishing it by Cisneros, who regarded polemics among scholars as counter-productive to the progress of biblical studies. Continued efforts by López Zúñiga after Cisneros' death led to prohibitions of the sale of his works by Leo X and Adrian VI. The popes had their reasons for suppressing criticism of Erasmus: they did not want to drive the influential humanist into the Lutheran camp.

Erasmus' critique of monasticism, voiced in his *Enchiridium militis Christiani*, in the widely read *Moria*, and again in his annotations on the New Testament, aroused considerable resentment in Spain. The Franciscan Luis de Carvajal answered Erasmus' arguments with a defence of monasticism. A conference instigated by the Spanish religious orders to investigate the orthodoxy of Erasmus' biblical scholarship was adjourned, however, and never reconvened, not least because of the favour Erasmus enjoyed at the Spanish court.

Luis Vives is perhaps the best-known representative of scholarly Spanish humanism today. His role in the humanist-scholastic controversy is discussed in Charles Fantazzi's essay, "Vives and the Pseudo-dialectitians." Erasmus' young contemporary and collaborator on the edition of the Works of St. Augustine, entered the fray against the

scholastic theologians with caustic criticism in the dialogue *Sapiens* and the epistle *Contra pseudodialecticos*. Both are manifestos of humanism that castigate the abstruse terminology of the scholastics and their lack of a moral imperative. Vives returned to the subject in his monumental *De disciplinis*, in which he denounced the scholastics as sophists responsible for corrupting Aristotelian dialectic. Unlike Erasmus, Vives never became a prominent target of the theologians, perhaps because his works enjoyed a more limited circulation in his own time or because he kept aloof from academic institutions and did not become involved in controversies surrounding the application of the humanistic method to the Scriptural text.

The section “The Faculty of Theology at Paris and the ‘Theologizing Humanists’” presents two essays on the subject by Guy Bedouelle (“Attacks on the Biblical Humanism of Jacques Lefèvre d’Etaples”) and James Farge (“Noël Beda and the Defense of the Tradition”). Lefèvre, who taught at the University of Paris, was dubbed the “restorer of Aristotle” in recognition of his work on the Greek philosopher. He first became involved in biblical studies with the publication of the *Quincuplex Psalterium* (1509), offering five versions of the Latin Psalter in parallel columns. However, he aroused the suspicions of the theologians only when he began to publish commentaries on the Pauline Epistles (1512) and to express doubts about the authorship of the Vulgate translation. Lefèvre’s support for Johann Reuchlin, whose case was then going forward, further aggravated the situation and compounded the resentment of the theologians against him. Shortly afterwards, Lefèvre became involved in a quarrel with Erasmus over the interpretation of Hebrews 2:7. Humanists regretted the controversy and urged the two men to direct their energies against the common enemy, the scholastic theologians. Both Erasmus and Lefèvre were attacked by Diego López Zúñiga in Spain and Pierre Cousturier and Noël Beda in France. Pierre Cousturier defended the Vulgate against all criticism and rejected any revisions or new translations as blasphemy. He ascribed the Vulgate to St. Jerome and insisted that it was divinely inspired. He objected to any stylistic improvements, moreover, arguing that the humble language of the Vulgate made it more accessible. He saw no need for vernacular translations at all, preferring that the clergy act as gatekeepers of the Word of God.

Beda, the syndic of the faculty of theology, saw to it that the works of the two humanists were formally examined. In 1523 the faculty investigated Lefèvre’s commentary on the four gospels (1522) and his

vernacular translations of the Bible; in 1525 they condemned a number of propositions from his homilies on the Epistles and gospels. In the following years Beda directed the faculty's inquiries into Erasmus's paraphrases of the New Testament and other works, which resulted in a formal condemnation in 1531. Beda regarded Erasmus and Lefèvre as *humanistae theologizantes*, "theologizing humanists," and ensured that the Paris censures carried an explicit warning against the presumption of men who thought that training in languages alone qualified them to comment on biblical texts. By the late 1520s, however, the faculty's fight against the humanists had merged with the fight against the reformers. Beda and his colleagues agitated against Erasmus and Lefèvre, not only for their trespasses on theological territory, but also for their advocacy of positions they identified as "Lutheran."

For some time the activities of the Paris theologians were held in check, since both Lefèvre and Erasmus enjoyed the patronage of the French court, but when Francis I was captured at the Battle of Pavia (1525) and became a prisoner of Charles V in Spain, the faculty proceeded unhindered with its investigation. Erasmus tried to negotiate with Beda in a series of epistolary exchanges, but found no common ground and could not prevent an official condemnation of his works. Lefèvre fled to reform-friendly Strasbourg, returning eventually under the protection of Marguerite Navarre, at whose court he lived for the remainder of his life. Both men's works, however, ended up on the Index of Forbidden Books.

With the section, "The Campaign against Biblical Humanists at the University of Leuven," the study of the humanist-scholastic debate moves to the Netherlands and to the university whose chancellor ascended the papal throne in 1522 as Adrian VI. The controversy between the faculty of theology and Erasmus, who was resident in Leuven from 1517 to 1521, was sustained over more than a decade, although papal and imperial decrees brought about a lull in the mid-twenties. In her essay "Martin Dorp and Edward Lee," Cecilia Asso examines the campaigns of two Leuven scholars against Erasmus' textual criticism of the Bible. Dorp questioned the purpose of Erasmus' undertaking in 1514, as the latter was preparing his New Testament edition for publication. As the mouthpiece of the theological faculty at Leuven (or so Erasmus alleged), Dorp argued that Greek manuscripts were doctrinally suspect and could not serve as a basis for correcting the Vulgate. Any changes to the received text, moreover, endangered the authority of the Church, he said. When Erasmus and Thomas

More convinced Dorp of the validity of the humanistic approach and the latter advertised his conversion to the principle *Ad fontes*, the faculty suspended his teaching licence for a time. Efforts by Alard of Amsterdam to lecture on Erasmus' *Ratio*, which promoted language studies for theology students, were similarly suppressed. It was at this time that Jacques Masson took up the cause of the scholastics, defending their approach in a dialogue *De tribus linguis* (1518). In his essay, "Leuven Theologians as Opponents of Erasmus and of Humanistic Theology," Marcel Gielis examines the role of Masson, who claimed that the Vulgate text was a satisfactory and sufficient basis for exegesis and agitated against the humanistic call for language studies and a return to the sources. Reading the biblical source text unaided was dangerous, Masson said. The neophyte needed the help of scholastic experts, whose interpretation represented the ecclesiastical tradition and who alone could provide a correct, orthodox exposition of the text. Later writings by Masson, attacking specific passages in Erasmus' works as heterodox, were suppressed when imperial and papal decrees imposed a moratorium on the warring factions. The prohibition did not keep the Dominican Vincentius Theoderici from publishing an anonymous pamphlet accusing Erasmus of Lutheran leanings or the Carmelite Nicolas Baechem from thundering against Erasmus from the pulpit.

In 1520, Edward Lee, then a student at the university of Leuven, published a detailed critique of Erasmus' first two editions of the New Testament. Lee, who was trained in the biblical languages and had studied theology at Oxford, did not attack the philological approach in principle. He took issue with specific passages in Erasmus' edition, which he regarded as unsound or fostering doctrinally questionable positions. He persevered with the publication of his critique counter to the advice of Thomas More and John Fisher, who had written to him on Erasmus' behalf. After bizarre efforts to suppress the publication of his critic's work, Erasmus responded to Lee with two surprisingly ill-tempered *apologiae*. Lee's efforts to revive the controversy when he was ambassador at Charles' court in Spain in 1526 did not come to fruition.

The last opponent to arise from the ranks of the faculty at Leuven was Frans Titelmans, whose attitude toward biblical humanism is examined by Paolo Sartori in "Frans Titelmans, the Congregation of Montaigu, and Biblical Scholarship." Apostrophized by Erasmus as a youngster who would be a "teacher of old men" (*gerontodidaskalos*), Titelmans made

an effort to give his criticism of the biblical humanists a literary cast. He wrote a dialogue, *Collationes Quinque* (1529), in which the merits of the philological approach to the scriptural text are discussed in an ahistorical setting by Erasmus, Lefèvre, and Valla. Titelmans himself is an interlocutor in these dialogues, which favour the view that the traditions of the church have a place in exegesis. In a follow-up on the polemic in 1530, Titelmans spoke more sharply, depicting Erasmus' writings as the source of the Lutheran reformation. Many of his disciples, he noted, became leading reformers and heretics.

The critics in Paris and Leuven shared a common background: Beda, Cousturier, Masson, and Titelmans had all been educated in houses directed or founded by Jan Standonck and breathed the spirit of the *Devotio Moderna*. They were reform-minded in the sense that they combated the corruption of the clergy, but they were conservative in their approach to church doctrine. Indeed, Titelmans entered the Capuchin order in Rome and embraced an austere life of abstinence and deprivation. It is ironic that Erasmus, too, had been a boarder at Montaigu, a college founded by Standonck, and thus was for a time subject to the same formative influences as his critics. Unlike his critics, however, he decried the ascetic practices of Montaigu as cruel and inhumane and ridiculed the lectures he attended there as crude and uninspired.

The final section dealing with critics of biblical humanism in sixteenth-century Italy, begins with Paul Grendler's examination, "Italian Biblical Humanism and the Papacy, 1515–1535." Among Hebraists who had some connection with the court were Felice da Prato, a Jewish convert, who published a Latin translation of the Psalter in 1515. The accompanying commentary explained points of grammar but refrained from criticizing the received translation. In 1517 da Prato published a polyglot Old Testament, which offered, for the first, time a Hebrew commentary. Pope Leo X, who was on excellent terms with the author, granted him a ten-year printing privilege. Da Prato also won the approbation of Leo's successor, Adrian VI. During the same time, Agostino Giustiniani published the so-called *Octaplum Psalterium*, a polyglot edition of the psalter (1516). The commentary he added evinces humanistic principles, citing Hebrew, classical, and patristic sources. While da Prato's Latin translation proved popular and saw a number of reprints, Giustiniani's scholarly polyglot sold only a quarter of the print run. Unlike da Prato, moreover, he criticized the traditional

version as untrustworthy. His efforts to obtain support at the papal court were unsuccessful, and he decamped for Paris to teach for some years under the auspices of King Francis I. A similar career path was taken by his contemporary, Agazio Guidacerio, who published a commentary on the Song of Songs, dedicating it to Clement VII. Earlier on he had published a Hebrew grammar, thanking Leo X for the use of the Vatican library. After losing his library in the Sack of Rome (1527), however, Guidacerio left for France, where he became *lecteur royal* at the nascent Collège de France. Both Giustiniani and Guidacerio established contact with Erasmus. Guidacerio unsuccessfully applied for a position at the Collegium trilingue in Leuven, where Erasmus resided at the time. Giustiniani visited, but failed to impress, Erasmus. Oddly, there is no evidence that the two scholars had any contact with fellow Italian biblicists Cajetan and Sante Pagnini.

Pagnini, encouraged by Pope Leo X, began publishing a bilingual Hebrew/Latin edition of the Psalter together with Jewish and Christian commentaries and his own grammatical explanations. In the preface he paid tribute to the humanistic method and emphasized the importance of consulting the text in the original language. The edition remained incomplete when Leo X stopped his subvention shortly before his death in 1521. Pagnini left for Avignon, but continued publishing in Italy. His Latin Bible appeared in 1528, dedicated to Pope Clement VII. Pagnini diverged from the humanistic ideal in presenting a literal, and therefore awkward, translation. Nevertheless his preface contained a typically humanist diatribe against scholastic theologians and their emphasis on logic. The edition had considerable influence both in Catholic and Protestant circles and became the basis of the famous Plantine edition of 1569–72.

Two biblicists with direct links to the papal court were Cardinals Cajetan (Tommaso de Vio) and Jacopo Sadoletto. Cajetan's *Ientacula Novi Testamenti* (1525), dedicated to Pope Clement VII, contains literary and textual criticism of biblical passages and is a quintessential humanistic effort. Numerous reprints in the sixteenth century attest to its popularity, and Cajetan continued to produce biblical commentaries and translations in his lifetime. The preface to his psalm commentary may be regarded as a manifesto of the humanistic philological method, prioritizing the use of texts in the original language. Although it is sometimes claimed that Cajetan, notorious for his interview with Luther in 1518, pursued biblical studies primarily to refute the Reformer, there is no internal evidence for such a purpose and few references to the subject

of heterodoxy. Indeed, his own commentaries came under suspicion and were investigated by the theologians at the University of Paris, whose initial attempt to censure Cajetan was quashed by Clement VII. After his death, however, the Dominican Lancelloto de' Politi attacked both Cajetan's and Erasmus' works as heterodox. His judgment was endorsed by the Parisian theologians.

While Cajetan was a theologian embracing humanistic principles, Jacopo Sadoletto came to biblical studies without such formal qualifications. He served as papal secretary under Clement VII and, after retiring to his bishopric in Carpentras, returned to Rome periodically, working on church reform and a reconciliation with the Protestants under Clement VII and Paul III. He wrote commentaries on books of the Old and New Testaments, but knowing little Hebrew and indeed showing little respect for Hebrew scholarship, he relied on the Greek version and on the Greek Fathers for his exposition. He expressed the principles of biblical humanism in his comments on the historical development of the biblical text, his opposition to scholastic exegesis, and his belief in rhetoric as an effective means of proclaiming the gospel message. In 1534 his commentary on Paul's Epistles was banned by Tommaso Badia, the Master of the Sacred Palace and the pope's official theologian. At the root of Badia's criticism was the question of Sadoletto's qualifications—the fact that he was no academic theologian. It was a typical issue in the debate between humanists and scholastic theologians at the time. Sadoletto, however, was able to satisfy the censor and retain his high standing at the papal court.

On the whole, the papal court took a benevolent attitude toward biblical humanism and offered occasional, though not programmatic or institutional support to its protagonists. Italian scholars generally remained on the sidelines of the theological dispute that was so prominent north of the Alps, that is, their criticism did not occur within the framework of the Luther Affair. Notable exceptions were Agostino Steuco and Alberto Pio, Prince of Carpi.

The Prince of Carpi is the subject of Nelson Minnich' essay, "Alberto Pio's Defense of Scholastic Theology." It is remarkable that Pio, an amateur theologian, provided one of the most effective defences of scholasticism. He was by no means hostile toward humanism. He intervened on Reuchlin's behalf with Leo X and was a patron of the humanistic circle of Johann Goritz. He first voiced his criticism of Erasmus in a private letter, expressing his disappointment over the fact that the humanist had not taken a firmer stand against Luther. His

contribution to the polemic over free will was weak, Pio said. He took issue, moreover, with Erasmus' criticism of church abuses and defended monasticism and the priesthood against his accusations. When Pio's letter was published, a polemic ensued. The prince's political fortunes had plummeted by that time, and he was living in exile in Paris, where he was encouraged by Beda to publish a detailed critique of Erasmus' works. The resulting *Twenty-Three Books*, which included a defence of the scholastic method, appeared posthumously. This did not prevent Erasmus from publishing a response, in which he angrily rejected attempts to depict him as heterodox. The focus of Pio's accusations is typical of the trajectory of the debate, in which the emphasis shifted from methodological to doctrinal questions. While the importance of philology for their discipline was gradually accepted by theologians and language studies became part of a theologian's training, the suspicion that humanistic studies were somehow connected with the rise of Lutheranism and/or heterodoxy continued to be voiced by Catholic critics throughout the first half of the sixteenth century.

Finally, Ronald Delph discusses Steuco's criticism in his essay, "Emending and Defending the Vulgate Old Testament: Agostino Steuco's Quarrel with Erasmus." Steuco had the distinction of having systematically compared the Vulgate text of the Pentateuch against the original Hebrew. His annotations are based on a scholarly procedure reflecting humanistic approaches to philology and history pioneered by Barbaro and Poliziano. He came to the task with excellent language skills and access to the Grimano library, which contained a plethora of Hebrew texts. His research convinced him that Jerome's text was superior to that of the Septuagint. This judgment brought him into conflict with Erasmus, resulting in a hostile exchange of letters in the 1530s—a regrettable development given that the two scholars shared an appreciation for the merits of language studies and the need to study the biblical text in the original.

The essays in this volume make clear that the battle lines between humanists and scholastics, men of letters and theologians, are not clearly drawn. From the beginning, there were scholastically trained theologians who embraced humanism and understood the value of philology, although they did not place it at the top of the list of qualifications necessary for an exegete. It is apparent furthermore that the leadership of the Catholic church, that is, the papal court, was not hostile toward humanistic studies and that the more determined resistance came from

academic circles. Here, too, more than principles were at stake. Career ambitions and personal animosities played a role as well. Finally, it is obvious that the scholastic critics were not quibbling fools, as they are sometimes depicted by humanists. Their arguments were not specious, but represented a valid point of view. In the eyes of many academic theologians a thorough knowledge of the scholastic tradition and its disquisitions into doctrinal points was essential for a correct interpretation of the bible. Humanists, on the other hand, believed that a thorough knowledge of the biblical languages and the historical context of the narrative was indispensable for an understanding of Scripture. Both views are defensible and by no means mutually exclusive. They clashed only when the parties insisted on the exclusive merit of their approach or expertise. Where the protagonists were prepared to accept a combination of skills, collaboration was possible and fruitful. Indeed by the middle of the sixteenth century numerous examples can be cited of theologians who combined a knowledge of biblical languages with a thorough training in the patristic and scholastic traditions. Thus Ulrich von Hutten's optimism was justified, when he wrote in 1518: "Studies are flourishing, spirits are stirring. Get a rope to hang yourself, Barbarism, and prepare for exile!"³ Fifty years later Petrus Ramus declared with satisfaction that the intellectual climate had changed dramatically over the course of a century. A hundred years ago, people spoke like barbarians, now there were "countless persons of all ages who speak and write Latin with elegance...and read Greek with the greatest ease." Once the scholastic Scotus ruled the world, now "Moses, the prophets, the apostles and the other true messengers of the gospel are speaking in their own languages."⁴ With the assimilation of humanism into the theological curriculum, the debate between scholastics and biblical humanists lost much of its urgency and gradually abated.

³ H. Scheible and D. Wuttke, eds., *Willibald Pirckheimers Briefwechsel*, 3 (Munich, 1989), p. 425.

⁴ Petrus Ramus in an oration of 1564, *P. Rami et Audomari Talei collectaneae prefationes, epistolae, orationes* (Paris, 1577), p. 305.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In editing the essays in this volume, I consulted with and benefited from the expertise of my colleagues. I would like to thank in particular Julian Deahl, who read the whole manuscript and provided valuable advice; to Ricardo Quinones who went over the English translation of Cecilia Asso's contribution; and to Gavin Hammel who shared with me the thorny task of checking the footnotes and drew up the list of abbreviations.

CRITICISM OF BIBLICAL HUMANISTS IN QUATTROCENTO ITALY

John Monfasani

Despite Lorenzo Valla's originality and the image sometimes given of his New Testament scholarship as especially transgressive,¹ one can argue that the pivotal figure in quattrocento biblical studies was Pope Nicholas V (1447–55).² Not only did Nicholas call Valla to Rome, integrate him into the Curial establishment, receive his dedication of the *Collatio Novi Testamenti*, and recommend the work to others in the papal court,³ he also was a great friend and protector of Giannozzo Manetti,

¹ See, e.g., Anna Morisi, "La filologia neotestamentaria di Lorenzo Valla," *Nuova rivista storica* 48 (1964), 35–49; Jacques Chomarat, "Les *Annotations* de Valla, celles d'Erasmus et la grammaire," in Olivier Fatio and Pierr Fraenkel, eds., *Histoire de l'exégèse au XVI^e siècle: Textes du colloque internationale tenu a Genève en 1976* (Geneva, 1978), pp. 202–28; and Salvatore I. Camporeale, *Lorenzo Valla: Umanesimo e teologia* (Florence, 1972), pp. 277–403, who stresses Valla's criticism of Thomas Aquinas and his polemic with Poggio Bracciolini.

² As Ursula Jaitner-Hahner, *Humanismus in Umbrien und Rom: Lilius Tifernas, Kanzler und Gelehrter des Quattrocento*, 1 (Baden-Baden, 1993), p. 745, n. 21, points out, in his biographical profile of Nicholas V, Vespasiano da Bisticci specifically called attention to the pope's devotion to Bible study: "et la Bibia tutta aveva a mente a suo proposito l'alegava. Feciongli questi testi della Scrittura Sancta grandissimo onore nel suo pontificato." Quotation from Vespasiano da Bisticci, *Le vite*, ed. Aulo Greco, 1 (Florence, 1970–76), 39.

³ See Nicholas of Cusa's letter to Valla in 1450 asking for a copy of the *Collatio* after Pope Nicholas V had yielded to him (*remisit*) his own copy to look at; Lorenzo Valla, *Epistole*, ed. Ottavio Besomi and Mariangela Regoliosi (Padua, 1984), pp. 350–51, no. 47a. Riccardo Fubini, *L'Umanesimo italiano e i suoi storici: Origini rinascimentali, critica moderna* (Milan, 2001), pp. 116 and 182, takes the position that Nicholas V blocked Valla's publication of the *Collatio* and then, in 1453, transferred his hopes for biblical scholarship to Giannozzo Manetti, but I do not see the evidence for such a scenario. In his polemic with Valla in 1452–53, Poggio Bracciolini, a papal secretary in the know about goings-on at the Curia, asserted that Valla had not published the *Collatio* for fear of being burned as a heretic; Poggio Bracciolini, *Opera Omnia*, 1, ed. Riccardo Fubini (Turin, 1964–69), p. 231. But he did not even hint, as he surely would have liked to, at any papal veto. In response, Valla explained that he was too occupied with other projects to publish the *Collatio* at the moment and quoted the letter of Cusanus cited above to prove how much Cusanus and Nicholas V thought of him ("quid etiam papa de me sentiat"); Lorenzo Valla, *Opera Omnia*, 1 (Turin, 1962), pp. 339–40. Furthermore, Valla nowhere ever suggested that he wished to translate the Bible, and he demonstrably continued to work on the *Collatio* in the last years of Nicholas V's pontificate. In essence, Fubini revived the rumor reported by Pierre Cousiturier in his *De Tralatione*

who shares Valla's fame as biblical humanist in the quattrocento.⁴ Furthermore, Nicholas encouraged translations of Greek patristic biblical commentaries, such as George of Trebizond's translations of John Chrysostom's sermons on Matthew, Cyril of Alexandria's commentary on John,⁵ and Gregory of Nyssa's *Vita Moysi*,⁶ as well as Lilius Tifernas's translation of pseudo-John Chrysostom's homilies on Job.⁷ In addition, Nicholas was the founder of the modern Vatican Library, which contained a rich collection of Greek bibles and Greek patristic commentaries,⁸ though the famous Codex Vaticanus of the Bible (Vat. Gr. 1209) seems to have entered the Vatican sometime between his pontificate and the inventory of 1481.⁹ It is conceivable but thus far not demonstrable that Lorenzo Valla used Vatican manuscripts in the revision of his *Collatio Novi Testamenti* once he transferred from Naples to Rome in 1448.¹⁰

Bibliae et Novarum Reprobatione Interpretationum of 1525 and rebuked by Erasmus in his *Apologia adversus Debachationes Petri Sutoris*: "Laurentius, inquit [Cousturier], non vertit totum Testamentum Novum, sed hoc molens cohibitus est auctoritate Pontificis." See Erasmus, *Opera Omnia*, ed. Jean Leclerc, 9 (Leiden, 1703–06), pp. 752–53; also Sebastiano Garofalo, "Gli umanisti italiani del secolo XV e la Bibbia," *Biblica* 27 (1946), 338–75, and in *La Bibbia e il Concilio di Trento: Conferenze tenute al Pontificio Istituto Biblico nel quarto centenario del Concilio di Trento* (Rome, 1947), pp. 38–75, at p. 53/353, n. 6.

⁴ See Giannozzo Manetti, *De Vita ac Gestis Nicolai Quinti Summi Pontificis*, ed. and tr. Anna Modigliani (Rome, 2005), p. 66, where in describing Nicholas's support of humanist translations, Manetti mentions his own *Adversus Iudeos et Gentes* and then says: "Nova deinde quedam utriusque et veteris et novi testamenti...in latinam linguam traductio non iniuria mentem irreperat."

⁵ Note that George did not translate Cyril's commentary on Leviticus as asserted by Charles Stinger, *Humanism and the Church Fathers: Ambrogio Traversari (1386–1439) and Christian Antiquity in the Italian Renaissance* (Albany, NY, 1977), p. 157.

⁶ See John Monfasani, ed., *Collectanea Trapezuntiana: Texts, Documents, and Bibliographies of George of Trebizond* (Binghamton, NY, 1984), pp. 715–17, 727–44. For Nicholas V's interest in the Fathers, see the surveys of Massimo Miglio, "Niccolò V umanista di Cristo," and Concetta Bianca, "Il pontificato di Niccolò e i Padri della Chiesa," in Sebastiano Gentile, ed., *Umanesimo e padri della Chiesa: manoscritti e incunabili di testi patristici da Francesco Petrarca al primo Cinquecento* (Rome, 1977), pp. 77–83 and 85–92 respectively.

⁷ Jaitner-Hahner, *Humanismus*, 1, 314–31.

⁸ See Robert Devreesse, *Le Fonds grec de la bibliothèque Vatican des origines à Paul V* (Vatican City, 1968), pp. 11–43, for Nicholas's Greek manuscripts. He owned a respectable number of New Testament texts with and without commentaries (see nos. 101–10, 139–45 on pp. 19–22), but only the Psalms, Job, Isaiah, Numbers, and Kings from the Old Testament (nos. 133–38, 146–50 on pp. 21–23). Nicholas had no specifically identified Hebrew collection.

⁹ Devreesse, *Fonds grec*, p. 73, suggests that no. 649 of the 1475 inventory might be the Codex Vaticanus, but, p. 82, first confidently identifies the Vaticanus only in the 1481 inventory, where it appears as no. 3.

¹⁰ Valla clearly consulted more Greek manuscripts once he moved to Rome, but identifying them is a dubious proposition; see Jerry Bentley, *Humanists and Holy Writ*

Nicholas V's encouragement of biblical studies was not an isolated endeavour but part and parcel of his patronage of humanist scholarship in general.¹¹ What is striking, however, is how isolated biblical studies were in the broad sweep of quattrocento humanism. To be sure, humanists had an interest in patristic literature and consequently disseminated patristic biblical scholarship.¹² In addition to the biblical commentaries translated by George of Trebizond and Lilius Tifernas, one might list Lampugnino Birago's translation of Basil the Great's *Hexaemeron*,¹³ John Argyropoulos's translation of the same,¹⁴ Athanasius Chalceopoulus's translation of Gregory of Nyssa's *De Oratione Dominica*,¹⁵ and the various translations of John Chrysostom's *Homeliae* on Ephesians, I–II Thessalonians, I–II Timothy, Philemon, and Titus, all by Ambrogio Traversari;¹⁶ on John and I Corinthians by Francesco di Mariotto Aretino;¹⁷ and *super Quinquagesimo Psalmo* by Theodore Gaza.¹⁸

(Princeton, 1983), p. 37. The Vatican was not Valla's only possible resource. E.g., one has to keep in mind that Cardinal Bessarion, a supporter of Valla, possessed a large collection of Greek biblical manuscripts, which amounted to at least thirty-five in 1472, about fifteen years after Valla died; see Lotte Labowsky, *Bessarion's Library and the Biblioteca Marciana: Six Early Inventories* (Rome, 1979), p. 433, matching Marc. Gr. 1–35 of the Biblioteca Marciana with the 1472 inventory of Bessarion's manuscripts. In the 1514 Prologue to the Complutensian polyglot Bible, the editors mention using a Bessarion manuscript sent by the Venetian Republic; see Beriah Botfield, *Prefationes et Epistolae Editionibus Principibus Auctorum Veterum Praepositae* (Cambridge, 1861), p. 47.

¹¹ See the notes of Anna Modigliani in Manetti, *Vita Nicolai Quinti*, pp. 57–66; and E.B. Fryde, *Humanism and Renaissance Historiography* (London, 1983), pp. 83–113.

¹² Exemplary studies in this regard are Sister Clare Way, "S. Gregorius Nazianzenus," in Paul O. Kristeller, F. Edward Cranz, and Virginia Brown, eds., *Catalogus translationum et commentariorum: Medieval and Renaissance Latin Translations and Commentaries* (Washington, D.C., 1960–), 2:43–192, 3:413; and Helen Brown Wicher, "Gregorius Nyssenus," in *ibid.*, 5:1–250. A useful overview is Mariarosa Cortesi, "Umanisti alla ricerca dei Padri greci," in Gentile, *Umanesimo e padri della Chiesa*, pp. 63–75.

¹³ See Irena Backus, *Lectures humanistes de Basile de Césarée: traductions latines (1439–1618)* (Paris, 1990), pp. 84–86, 89–92; and Cortesi, "Umanisti alla ricerca," p. 74.

¹⁴ The work is dedicated to Pope Sixtus IV; see Backus, *Lectures humanistes*, pp. 86, 89–90, 92. Giovanni Cammelli, *I dotti bizantini e le origini dell'Umanesimo*. vol. 2: *Giovanni Argyropulo* (Florence, 1941), has nothing to say of this translation save to cite, on p. 184, Émile Legrand, *Bibliographie hellénique des XV^e et XV^e siècles* (Paris, 1885–1902; reprint Paris, 1962), who at 3:205–06, accurately describes the *editio princeps* of Rome, 1515. For the 1520 edition see Eugene F. Rice, Jr., *The Preparatory Epistles of Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples and Related Texts* (New York, 1972), pp. 419–21.

¹⁵ Wicher, "Gregorius Nyssenus," pp. 144–45.

¹⁶ Stinger, *Humanism*, p. 153.

¹⁷ Stinger, *Humanism*, p. 157.

¹⁸ Valencia, Biblioteca del Catedral, MS 231, fols. 189v–200r; see Paul O. Kristeller, *Iter Italicum: A Finding List of Uncatalogued or Incompletely Catalogued Humanistic Manuscripts of the Renaissance in Italian and Other Libraries*, 4 (Leiden – London, 1963–97), p. 650.

We can also point to Teodoro de' Lelli's edition of Jerome, which, though hardly on the same plane as Erasmus's grand 1516 edition of Jerome, was a notable achievement in its time and served as the basis of Giovanni Andrea Bussi's *editio princeps* of Jerome in Rome in 1468.¹⁹ Nonetheless, these works are slim pickings amid the bountiful harvest of quattrocento humanism. Moreover, unlike earlier medieval biblical studies, quattrocento humanism was indifferent or, as is clear in the case of the most popular of quattrocento authors, Leonardo Bruni,²⁰ hostile, to Hebrew studies.²¹ Indeed, in the clamorous execution of Jews for their supposed ritual murder of Blessed Simon of Trent in 1475, two leading humanists, Platina (Bartolomeo Sacchi) and Pomponio Leto, wrote to support the proceedings while a scholar trained in the older traditions of canon law, Battista de' Guidi, opposed the travesty.²²

Given the quattrocento humanists' primary devotion to classical literature, their lack of interest in biblical Hebrew is hardly surprising. When compared to the scholastics, however, the Italian humanists proved to have a greater linguistic range in Scripture studies, working in Hebrew as well as Greek. Robert Grosseteste (1168–1253) may have learned Greek and commented on Galatians,²³ and Roger Bacon

¹⁹ See Eugene F. Rice, Jr., *Saint Jerome in the Renaissance* (Baltimore – London, 1985), pp. 121–22. For Giovanni Andrea Bussi's prefaces to Jerome see G.A. Bussi, *Prefazioni alle edizioni di Sweynheym e Pannartz, prototipografi romani*, ed. Massimo Miglio (Milan, 1978), pp. 3–11.

²⁰ See Charles Trinkaus, "In Our Image and Likeness": *Humanity and Divinity in Italian Humanist Thought*, 2 (Chicago, 1970), 578–81.

²¹ For biblical studies from the ninth to the fourteenth centuries, see Beryl Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1941); eadem, *Studies in Medieval Thought and Learning from Abelard to Wyclif* (London, 1981); William McKane, *Selected Christian Hebraists* (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 42–75 (for Andrew of St. Victor); Philip D.W. Krey and Lesley Smith, eds., *Nicholas of Lyra: The Senses of Scripture* (Leiden, 2000); and the fundamental Heinrich Denifle, "Die Handschriften der Bibel-Correctorien des 13. Jahrhunderts," *Archiv für Literatur- und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters*, 4 (1888), 263–311, 471–601.

²² See Willehad Paul Eckert, "Beatus Simoninus—Aus den Akten des Trienter Judenprozesses," in W.P. Eckert and E.L. Ehrlich, eds., *Judenhass—Schuld der Christen?: Versuch eines Gesprächs* (Essen, 1964), pp. 329–58; Battista de' Guidici, *Apologia Iudaeorum: Invektiva contra Platinam. Propaganda antiebraica e polemiche di Curia durante il pontificato di Sisto IV (1471–1484)*, ed. and tr. Diego Quaglioni (Rome, 1987); R. Po-chia Hsia, *Trent 1475: Stories of a Ritual Murder Trial* (New Haven, 1992); and Anna Esposito and Diego Quaglioni, *Processi contro gli ebrei di Trento (1475–1478)* (Padua, 1990–).

²³ See Beryl Smalley, "The Biblical Scholar," in D.A. Callus, ed., *Robert Grosseteste, Scholar and Bishop: Essays in Commemoration of the Seventh Centenary of his Death* (Oxford, 1955), pp. 70–97, esp. p. 75: "By the time he was working up his notes on Galatians his Greek studies had begun. He compares the Latin Vulgate text with the Greek."

(c. 1214–92) may have complained about the *ignorantia Graeci et Hebraei* in Scripture studies,²⁴ but the fact remains that all the major medieval Scripture scholars who could read more than Latin before the Renaissance humanists were Hebraists: Nicola Maniacutia,²⁵ the Victorines, and Nicholas of Lyra,²⁶ in addition to anti-Jewish polemicists such as Ramón Martí (d. after 1280), and Paul of Burgos (1350–1435), who made use of the Hebrew Old Testament.²⁷ Despite the Greek bias of the quattrocento humanists, on the other hand, not only did the celebrated Giannozzo Manetti and Giovanni Pico della Mirandola have Hebrew, but so did the lesser known biblical commentator Pietro de' Rossi.²⁸ Moreover, though the Franciscan Cabalist Pietro Galatino (Colonna) (1464/65–after 1539) and the Dominican biblicists Agostino Giustiniani (1470–1536) and Sante Pagnini (1470–1541) made their mark in the sixteenth century, they seem to have started their study of Hebrew in the fifteenth.²⁹

In the face of the corruptions of the Latin Vulgate the Hebraists from the twelfth century to Giannozzo Manetti in the fifteenth century appealed to the *Hebraica sermonis veritas*, just as Lorenzo Valla (1406–57)³⁰ appealed to the *Graeca veritas* when correcting the Vulgate New Testament. Most often they were right to do so. But what the Hebraists did not realize was that the Septuagint upon which the Vulgate was based possessed independent critical value inasmuch as it reflected an

²⁴ J.S. Brewer, ed., *Opus Minus* (London, 1859), pp. 349–52.

²⁵ See Vittorio Peri, “Nicola Maniacutia: un testimone della filologia romana del XII secolo,” *Aevum* 41 (1967), 67–90.

²⁶ See n. 21 above.

²⁷ See A. Lukyn Williams, *Adversus Judaeos: A Bird's-Eye View of Christian Apologiae Until the Renaissance* (Cambridge, 1935), pp. 248–55, 267–76. For Nicholas of Lyra's use of Martí in his commentary, see Herman Hailperin, *Rashi and the Christian Scholars* (Pittsburgh, 1963), pp. 287 n. 45, 288 n. 61, 314 n. 271.

²⁸ See Gianfranco Fioravanti, “Pietro de' Rossi: Bibbia ed Aristotele nella Siena del '400,” *Rinascimento*, 2nd ser., 20 (1980), 87–159; reprinted in his *Università e città: Cultura umanistica e cultura scolastica a Siena nel '400* (Florence, 1981), pp. 55–127, at p. 113/81: “ma non si può negare che egli abbia raggiunto un certo livello di padronanza personale della lingua [Hebrew]. Spesso infatti Pietro ci parla dei suoi maestri Giudei.”

²⁹ See C. Colombero, “Colonna, Pietro (Pietro Galatino),” in *Dizionario biografico degli italiani* 27 (1982), pp. 402–04; D. Busolini, “Giustiniani, Agostino,” in *ibid.*, 20 (2001), pp. 301–06; and Jean Quétif and Jean Echard, *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum*, 2–1 (Paris, 1729–23; reprint New York, ca. 1959), pp. 114–18.

³⁰ For his date of birth see John Monfasani, “*Disputationes Vallianae*,” in Fosca Mariani Zini, ed., *Penser entre les lignes: Philologie et Philosophie au Quattrocento* (Lille, 2001), pp. 229–50, at pp. 229–31; reprinted as Essay XII in John Monfasani, *Greeks and Latins in Renaissance Italy: Studies on Humanism and Philosophy in the 15th Century* (Aldershot, Hampshire, 2005).

Old Testament text predating that found in contemporary Hebrew manuscripts.³¹ Likewise, Lorenzo Valla did not understand that the Vulgate and even more so the old Latin version, of which the Vulgate was a revision, reflected a text in significant respects different from and earlier than the Greek text of the Byzantine recension upon which he relied.³² As we shall see, the independent value of the Old Latin translation and the Vulgate became an issue concerning at least one emendation proposed by Valla.

We should also make another distinction. It is quite wrong to suppose, as is sometimes implied, that the medieval church and scholars opposed corrections to the Vulgate. Making such corrections was precisely why medieval Hebraists stressed the *Hebraica veritas*. Furthermore, the substantial lists of variants and alternate readings found in the medieval Bible *Correctoria* become pointless unless they were collected to correct the received Latin text.³³ The difference between Valla and his medieval predecessors, at least as far as the New Testament is concerned, is that Valla wished to correct not just corruptions of the Vulgate but the Vulgate itself. In the preface to Pope Paul II for his translation of St. Basil's *Hexameron*, Lampugnino Birago defended his right to provide, where needed, an improvement upon the Vulgate version of biblical passages quoted by Basil.³⁴ Similarly, Giannozzo Manetti provided a complete alternate Latin translation of the New Testament from the Greek. Manetti set out to do the same for the Old Testament from the Hebrew, though in fact he only completed a translation of the Psalms. Finally, far from being hostile to Valla's and Manetti's projects, Pope

³¹ This is a theme in McKane, *Selected Christian Hebraists*. One has to wait for Richard Simon (1638–1712) for a clear perception of the independent value of the Septuagint. For the seventeenth-century controversy concerning the date of the vowel points in the Hebrew Bible, see Stephen G. Burnet, *From Christian Hebraism to Jewish Studies: Johannes Buxtorf (1564–1629) and Hebrew Learning in the Seventeenth Century* (Leiden, 1996), pp. 203–39.

³² On the Old Latin and Vulgate as witnesses to the text of the New Testament, see Bruce Manning Metzger and Bart D. Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*, 4th ed. (Oxford, 2005), pp. 100–09. See also P.R. Ackroyd, C.F. Evans, G.W.H. Lampe, and S.L. Greenslade, eds., *The Cambridge History of the Bible* (Cambridge, 1970), 1:337–38 and 3:204; and Bentley, *Humanists and Holy Writ*, pp. 45–46.

³³ For a sample of these *Correctoria* see Denifle, “Bibel-Correctorien,” pp. 485–597; for the impressive preface of one of these *Correctoria*, see *ibid.*, pp. 295–310. Roger Bacon thought the correctors aggravated the problem by collecting readings that “then crept into the text.” See Smalley, *Study of the Bible*, p. 247.

³⁴ See Cortesi, “Umanisti alla ricerca,” p. 74.

Nicholas V fostered them while cardinals such as Bessarion and Nicholas of Cusa encouraged Valla. Indeed, Valla's most vociferous critics were not scholastic theologians but fellow humanists of considerable accomplishment, namely, Poggio Bracciolini and George of Trebizond. In short, quattrocento biblical criticism did not play out in a way that fits a simplistic medieval vs. Renaissance storyline.

Lorenzo Valla was the first significant biblical scholar of the Renaissance. He set himself the task of comparing the Vulgate to the Greek text of the New Testament during his amazingly fruitful period, 1435–48, at the south Italian court of King Alfonso the Magnanimous. He seems to have completed a first draft by 1443 and continued to work on this version up to 1453, five years after coming to Rome from Naples. He called this first recension *Collatio Novi Testamenti* and dedicated it to Pope Nicholas V.³⁵ From 1453 to his death in 1457 Valla revised this first version, leaving at his death a clearly more sophisticated, though shorter, text that carried the title *In Latinam Novi Testamenti Interpretationem Annotationes* in the 1505 *editio princeps* put through the press by its discoverer, Erasmus of Rotterdam.³⁶ The *Annotationes*, which were the only recension available in print until 1970, have in common only about 60% of the lemmata found in the *Collatio*,³⁷ and even in the case of these common lemmata the *Annotationes* offer a considerable revision of the *Collatio*. Valla's work enjoyed a minimal circulation³⁸ until Erasmus discovered a copy of the *Annotationes* in the abbey of Parc outside of Leuven in the summer of 1504. From that point on, it has been the object of divergent interpretations and serves almost as a Rorschach test of one's attitude towards Valla. Erasmus drew inspiration from it and spent much of his preface defending the notion that a *grammaticus* (ostensibly Valla, but as the future would reveal, really Erasmus himself)

³⁵ For the history of the text see Alessandro Perosa's preface to his edition of Valla's *Collatio Novi Testamenti* (Florence, 1970).

³⁶ The single extant manuscript of the second recension has a different title: *Correctio Novi Testamenti*; see the description of MS 4031–4033 of the Bibliothèque Royale Albert I^{er}, Brussels, in J. Van den Gheyn et al., *Catalogue des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Royale di Belgique*, 1 (Brussels, 1901–48), p. 91, no. 211. For a compendium of the *Annotationes* prepared by an unknown fifteenth-century scholar, see Riccardo Fubini, "Una sconosciuta testimonianza manoscritta delle «Annotationes in Novum Testamentum»," in his *L'Umanesimo italiano*, pp. 169–83.

³⁷ See Perosa in Valla, *Collatio*, p. XXVII.

³⁸ In addition to the *codex unicus* of the *Annotationes*, only two manuscripts of the *Collatio* survive; see Perosa in Valla, *Collatio*, pp. IX–XVII.

could legitimately treat *sacrae litterae*.³⁹ Erasmus's scriptural method would go far beyond Valla's narrow grammatical approach, and he would at times express annoyance at Valla's tendency to quibble over minutiae.⁴⁰ In modern times, the biblical scholar Salvatore Garofalo judged that "Valla knows how to play the nitpicker over syllables; he lacks the mettle to attempt a solid and accomplished interpretation; exegesis is not bread for his teeth... [he] is the man who strains out the grammatical gnat, but is completely capable of swallowing the exegetical elephant."⁴¹ The great Reformation scholar Roland Bainton was exasperated by what he saw as Valla's obsession with grammatical *quisquiliae*.⁴² In two contributions, Jerry Bentley gives a well calibrated discussion of Valla's weaknesses and strengths.⁴³ In his book on Valla, Mario Fois, S.J., argued that Valla was not just a grammarian or a "purist obsessed with classical elegance,"⁴⁴ but nonetheless was concerned to demonstrate how orthodox Valla was in the *Annotationes*.⁴⁵ In his book on Valla, Salvatore Camporeale, O.P., spontaneously seconded Fois as he sought to place Valla in the tradition of St. Jerome against Poggio Bracciolini's charges of heresy.⁴⁶ Conversely, the purpose of Anna Morisi's study was precisely to prove how revolutionary and transgressive Valla was

³⁹ Ep. 182, Allen 1, pp. 406–12.

⁴⁰ See Jerry H. Bentley, "Biblical Philology and Christian Humanism: Lorenzo Valla and Erasmus as Scholars of the Gospels," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 8 (1977), 8–28, at pp. 14 and 22. See also Erika Rummel, *Erasmus' Annotations on the New Testament: From Philologist to Theologian* (Toronto, 1986), p. 88: "In many cases Valla's findings formed no more than a point of departure for Erasmus... It must also be acknowledged that the sum total of Valla's notes is small by comparison with Erasmus' detailed commentary."

⁴¹ Garofalo, "Gli umanisti italiani," pp. 52–53/352–53: "Il Valla sa di essere uno spulciatore di sillabe al quale manca il nerbo per affrontare una interpretazione solida e compiuta; l'esegesi non è pane per i suoi denti... Il Valla della *Collatio* è indiscutibilmente il Valla delle *Elegantiae linguae latinae*, del *De reciprocatione sui et suus*, è un uomo che filtra un moscerino grammaticale, ma è capacissimo d'ingoiare un elefante esegetico."

⁴² Roland Bainton, *Erasmus of Christendom* (New York, 1969), p. 85.

⁴³ Bentley, "Biblical Philology"; and idem, *Humanists and Holy Writ*, pp. 32–69.

⁴⁴ Mario Fois, *Il pensiero cristiano di Lorenzo Valla nel quadro storico-culturale del suo ambiente* (Rome, 1969), p. 429; this section covers pp. 422–29.

⁴⁵ Ibid., pp. 429–40.

⁴⁶ Camporeale, *Lorenzo Valla*, cited in n. 1 above, pp. 277–403, which is dominated by an explication of Valla's controversy with Poggio; cf. p. 323: "Il Valla, dunque, intendeva riprendere e continuare il lavoro filologico di S. Girolamo... Egli dunque si trovava non al di fuori dell'ortodossia, come pretendeva Poggio." For the record, I note here that Camporeale told me in 1982 or 1983 that when still a graduate student, he, and not Perosa, discovered the text of the *Collatio*. Pointedly, Perosa never claims in his edition that he discovered the text. For Camporeale's criticism of Perosa on some points see his *Lorenzo Valla*, pp. 24 and 356.

in the *Annotationes*.⁴⁷ Jacques Chomarat also gives us a transgressive Valla in his article comparing Valla with Erasmus.⁴⁸ Charles Trinkaus wants us to see a “radical” Valla.⁴⁹ Lastly, Christopher Celenza, in an article sampling Valla’s comments on Romans 12:1–13:7,⁵⁰ and Jean-Claude Margolin in an article comparing Valla, Erasmus, John Colet, and Jacques Lefèvre on Romans 11, earnestly try to show how Valla’s grammatical comments have theological implications.⁵¹

Trinkaus’s two examples do have theological relevance, but one, as Trinkaus admitted, resulted in no substantial change in meaning;⁵² in the other Trinkaus was simply wrong to say that “Valla attacks the notion of cooperative or creative grace.”⁵³ *Pace* Margolin, all ten of the examples he cites of Valla’s annotation on Romans 11 are narrowly grammatical and take on theological coloration only if one brings into the conversation Erasmus’s comments. Similarly, despite Celenza’s attempt to tease some exegetical gold out of Valla’s annotations on the *Epistle to the Romans*, these notes cannot but strike one as intensely grammatical. Nonetheless, Paul’s *Epistle to the Romans* is a good place

⁴⁷ Morisi, “La filologia neotestamentaria,” cited in n. 1 above.

⁴⁸ Chomarat, “Les *Annotations* de Valla,” cited in n. 1 above.

⁴⁹ Trinkaus, “*In Our Image and Likeness*,” 2:574: “But what was essentially radical in Valla’s textual criticism was his grasp of the theological implications. . . .”

⁵⁰ Christopher Celenza, “Renaissance Humanism and the New Testament: Lorenzo Valla’s Annotations to the Vulgate,” *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 24 (1994), 33–52.

⁵¹ Jean-Claude Margolin, “The Epistle to the Romans (Chapter 11) according to the Versions and/or Commentaries of Valla, Colet, Lefèvre, and Erasmus,” in David C. Steinmetz, ed., *The Bible in the Sixteenth Century* (Durham, NC, 1990), pp. 136–66, at pp. 142–51.

⁵² Trinkaus, “*In Our Image and Likeness*,” p. 576, concerning 2 Cor. 7:10 in the *Annotationes* (*Opera*, 1:872): “Valla did not change the translation substantially.” Rather, as Trinkaus points out, Valla denied that the passage can be used to equate sadness with penance, after which he denies that it supports the doctrine of penance as composed of contrition, confession, and satisfaction. I do not know whom Valla is attacking, but the passage can hardly be used to prove this threefold division; e.g., in 11 citations Thomas Aquinas never used it for this purpose. (I used the concordance *Index Thomisticus* of the *Corpus Thomisticum* of Robertus Busa et al. at <http://www.corpusthomisticum.org>.)

⁵³ Trinkaus, “*In Our Image and Likeness*,” p. 575, concerning 1 Cor. 15:10 in the *Annotationes* (*Opera*, 1:868). Rather, as in the previous example, Valla denied that the passage can be used to support a particular doctrine, in this case cooperating grace (“Nihil dicant qui hanc vocant gratiam dei cooperantem. Paulus enim sibi hoc non tribuit, sed totum a deo refert acceptum.”). This scriptural passage, however, is really a proof text for habitual grace (cf. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, III, q. 7, a. 1, arg.2). The issue of cooperating grace is a much broader one and is not decided by this passage. What Valla reveals here is not his theological acumen, but his predestinarian bias towards a grace that determines rather than aids our wills.

to start an examination of Valla's *Annotationes* because of passages such as Romans 8:29–30 (“Nam quos praescivit et praedestinavit... quos autem praedestinavit hos et vocavit et quos vocavit hos et iustificavit” in the Vulgate) or Romans 8:33 (“Quis accusabit adversus electos Dei? Deus qui iustificat, quis est qui condemnet?”) fit perfectly with the predestinarian view Valla expressed at the end of his *Dialogue on Free Will*. Yet Valla has not a word to say about these passages in the *Annotationes* or in the *Collatio*.⁵⁴ In the *Dialogue on Free Will*, he quoted Romans 9:11–21,⁵⁵ but in the *Annotationes* and the *Collatio* he had only three narrow philological comments to make on these verses.⁵⁶ If one argues that he said nothing because his only concern was identifying mismatches between the Vulgate and the *Graeca veritas*, why then did he pass over in silence the absence in the Greek of the famous Trinitarian *comma Iohanneum* in the Vulgate, that is, the passage at 1 John 5:8 (“Quoniam tres sunt qui testimonium dant in caelo: Pater, Verbum, et Spiritus Sanctus, et hi tres unum sunt.”)? Yet, in the *Annotationes*, in Romans 8, Valla criticised the Vulgate for using “sapiunt” and “sentiant” in verse 5 where the Greek has only the single word *phronousin*; in verse 7, for translating Greek *phronema* as “sapientia” instead of “prudentia” for the sake of *varietas*; in verse 10, for saying “vivit” instead of “vita” since the Greek word is *zoe*; in verse 16, for using “pater” as a vocative when it is in the nominative case in Greek; in verse 27, for translating as “scit” instead of “novit” the Greek *oiden*; in verse 28, for translating as “cooperantur” (plural) the Greek singular *synergei*; in verse 32, for translating “donavit,” (past tense) for the Greek future *charisetai*; in verse 34, for translating as “interpellat” the Greek *entygchanei* whereas the same word is translated as “postulat” in verses 26 and 27 (that is, the sin of inappropriate *varietas*); and, finally, in verse 38, for translating as “certus sum” instead of as “persuasus sum” the Greek *pepeismai* (“I am persuaded”). Valla’s discussion of Romans 8 in the *Collatio* is much shorter, containing only six lemmata, but he repeated four of them (vv. 28, 32, 34, and 38; that is, the 60% average postulated by Perosa) in the *Annotationes*. Given Valla’s complete avoidance of the issue of predeterminism in annotating these chapters of Romans, his outburst

⁵⁴ For the *Annotationes*, see Valla, *Opera Omnia*, 1:857–58; for the *Collatio*, see Perosa’s edition, pp. 186–87.

⁵⁵ See the translation by Charles Trinkaus in Ernst Cassirer et al., eds., *The Renaissance Philosophy of Man* (1948, repr. Chicago, 1965), p. 187.

⁵⁶ Valla, *Collatio*, p. 187; Valla, *Annotationes*, p. 858, for Rom. 9:15, 19, 21.

concerning cooperating grace at I Cor. 15:10, cited by Trinkaus, is all the more striking and exceptional.⁵⁷

We get the same focus on tightly limited grammatical correction if we look at a different set of New Testament passages relevant to another theological issue on which Valla gave his opinion in a separate work. In his *Sermo de Mystério Eucharistie*, delivered in Rome in 1456 or 1457, Valla played with a notion of the Eucharist that was a form of consubstantiation or impanation. His argument is too ambiguous to allow us to decide between these two options, but he clearly did not endorse the traditional doctrine of transubstantiation.⁵⁸ Yet if we look at his annotations on the institution of the Eucharist in the Synoptic Gospels (Matt. 26:26–29; Mark 14:22–25; Luke 22:18–20) or the sermon on the bread of life in John 6:30–72 or Paul's description of the Eucharist in I Corinthians 11:23–25, we again find him either avoiding the relevant passages or noting narrow grammatical points without a word of exegesis which would suggest his views on the Eucharist.⁵⁹

Valla was obviously determined to steer clear of theology in the *Annotationes* except tangentially or exceptionally (as in the two instances cited by Trinkaus). To be sure, he did provocatively express his doubts about Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite,⁶⁰ but this was an historical, not a theological issue. The same can be said of his criticism of Augustine for claiming that the opening of the Gospel of John can be found in certain *libri Platonici* translated into Latin.⁶¹ His criticism of Thomas Aquinas and Remigius for commenting on Scripture without a knowledge of Greek may reflect professional one-upmanship, but, again, was not theological.⁶² Also, getting on his philological high horse,

⁵⁷ See n. 53 above.

⁵⁸ See John Monfasani, "The Theology of Lorenzo Valla," in Jill Kraye and M.W.F. Stone, eds., *Humanism and Early Modern Philosophy* (London, 2000), pp. 229–50, at pp. 8–9 (Essay XI in Monfasani, *Greeks and Latins*).

⁵⁹ In the *Collatio* he only commented on Mark 14:22 (with a reference to the corresponding passage in Luke) and 1 Cor. 11:23–24; in the *Annotationes* on Mark 14:22 (with the reference to Luke) and 1 Cor. 11:23–24 again.

⁶⁰ In the *Collatio*, p. 167; in the *Annotationes*, p. 852, col. 2. For the question of Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, see John Monfasani, "Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite in Mid-Quattrocento Rome," in James Hankins, John Monfasani, and Frederick Purnell, Jr., eds., *Supplementum Festivum: Studies in Honor of Paul Oskar Kristeller* (Binghamton, NY, 1987), pp. 189–219; reprinted as Essay IX in John Monfasani, *Language and Learning in Renaissance Italy* (Aldershot, Hampshire, 1994).

⁶¹ *Opera Omnia*, p. 846, at the end of John. This comment is missing from the *Collatio*.

⁶² *Ibid.*, pp. 803 (Remigius) and 865 (Remigius and Thomas); *Collatio*, p. 237, 242, and 244 (Remigius). As Bentley, *Humanists and Holy Writ*, p. 60, pointed out, the author

Valla poured professional scorn on St. Bernardino of Siena's famous trigramma (IHS) as an ignorant misunderstanding of the Greek spelling of Iesus, but he sensibly omitted this attack in the *Annotationes*.⁶³ Since Valla completed a first draft by 1443 and his brush with the Inquisition in Naples occurred in 1444 or later,⁶⁴ he must have made the prudential decision to limit the scope of his work before he came under any threat. Given his penchant for daring opinions, this was no doubt a wise choice. By sticking to the textual and linguistic evidence, Valla remained in his element and on defensible ground. As events proved, his plan to bring the Latin New Testament in line with the *Graeca veritas* and with more correct Latin usage garnered him the support of Nicholas V and of cardinals sympathetic to his project. So Garofalo was perhaps unfair to say that Valla lacked the mettle (*nerbo*) for exegesis. Conversely, those scholars who espy theological depth or controversy in the *Annotationes* are discovering what Valla did not put there. Ever since Delio Cantimori called attention to the use that sixteenth-century Unitarians made of Valla,⁶⁵ the transgressive Valla has almost become an article of faith. But Michael Servetus and Lelio Sozzini were appealing to the Valla's *Elegantie* and *Dialectica*, not to the *Annotationes*. Although he eventually changed the title of his work, Valla never departed from his plan to keep his work strictly a *collatio* and not a jumping off point for exegetical analysis.

In his preface to Pope Nicholas V and in his earlier preface to the reader, Valla claimed the mantle of St. Jerome in confronting the

Valla called ninth-century commentator Remigius (of Auxerre) was in fact the ninth-century commentator Haimo of Auxerre; but this was not always the case since Valla criticized Remigius concerning Matthew (*Opera Omnia*, p. 803), a book upon which Haimo did not comment, but which Remigius did; see Friedrich Stegmüller, *Repertorium Biblicum Medii Aevi* (Madrid, 1950–80), 3:7–8 for Haimo; 5:64–81 and 9:366–72 for Remigius. For Valla and Thomas, in addition to the articles by Hanna Gray and John W. O'Malley, cited by Bentley, *Humanists and Holy Writ*, pp. 60–61, n. 20, now see also Salvatore Camporeale, "Lorenzo Valla: *Adnotationes in Novum Testamentum* ed *Encomion s. Thomae*, alle origini della 'Teologia umanistica' nel primo '400," in *Il sacro nel Rinascimento: Atti del XII Convegno internazionale (Chianciano-Pienza 17–20 luglio 2000)* (Florence, 2002), pp. 581–95.

⁶³ Valla, *Collatio*, pp. 11–13. As Perosa points out (p. XXXV) Valla had prudential reasons to drop this passage inasmuch as St. Bernardino was canonized in 1450.

⁶⁴ See Gianni Zippel, "L'autodifesa di Lorenzo Valla per il processo dell'inquisizione napoletana (1944)," *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 13 (1970), 59–94; and John Monfasani, *Fernando of Cordova: A Biographical and Intellectual Profile* (Philadelphia, 1992), pp. 9–10.

⁶⁵ Delio Cantimori, *Eretici italiani del Cinquecento. Ricerche storiche* (Florence, 1939), pp. 42 and 239.

corrupt state of the Latin translation of the New Testament.⁶⁶ Valla wished, he explained, to examine whether the Latin text conformed to its “Greek source,” that is, to the *Graeca veritas*.⁶⁷ To the charge that he was assaulting Jerome’s translation, Valla responded that he intended to defend Jerome, not attack him.⁶⁸ In reality, however, Valla set out to purge the Vulgate not only of scribal corruptions, but also of translation errors, as is clear in the *Collatio/Annotationes* themselves and as he himself admitted in the two prefaces to the *Collatio*. He promised to pluck the thistles inadvertently left behind, as it were, in Jerome’s harvest.⁶⁹ He also wanted to eliminate the inaccuracies created by passages rendered in word-for-word fashion in Jerome’s Vulgate.⁷⁰ In a way, Valla was replicating in the fifteenth century Jerome’s attempt to bring the rustic Old Latin translation of the Bible up to late antique Latin standards. Valla sought to bring it up to the revived classical standards of quattrocento humanism.⁷¹

Valla’s emendations could not, of course, but suffer from the quality of the manuscripts he used. For the *Collatio*, Perosa notes that in Matthew more than a third of Valla’s Vulgate citations and about ten percent of his Greek citations do not correspond to modern editions.⁷² Moreover, like Erasmus, he used Greek manuscripts reflecting an inferior

⁶⁶ Perosa publishes both prefaces in Valla, *Collatio*, pp. 3–7 (to Nicholas V) and pp. 7–10 (<*Praefationis Forma Antiquior*>).

⁶⁷ Ibid., 8.26–27: “Nempe an nostra prorsus cum greco fonte consentiant, id est cum greca veritate.”

⁶⁸ Ibid., 9.22–23: “ego defensum sane quam impugnatum Hieronymum malo.”

⁶⁹ Ibid., p. 6.10–12: “tanquam eius metentis specias, que vel neglecte effuerunt vel exiles vel manus effugerunt vel ligando exciderunt.” Ibid., 10.10–11: “siquidem non omnia se ille ait emendasse sed que intellectum maxime depravarent.” As Bentley, *Humanists and Holy Writ*, p. 48, notes, several times in the *Annotationes* Valla pointed out discrepancies between the Vulgate and how Jerome translated the same passages elsewhere, casting doubt on whether Jerome was responsible for the Vulgate at these points; e.g., at Luke 16:2 (*Opera*, 1:837): “Non fuisse Hieronymum utique qui Novum Testamentum ita interpretatus est vel hinc patet” ; and at 1 Cor. 2:9 (*Opera*, 1:862): “ut appareat aut non esse hunc interpretem Hieronymum aut eius interpretationem fuisse corruptam.”

⁷⁰ Ibid., p. 6.14–16: “Huc accedit quod non semper excutio greca, sed in latinis siquid ambiguum contingit aperio, siquid lex ad verbum transferendi obscurius facit illustro.” P. 9.29–31: “Adde huc multa transferri obscure, non interpretis vitio, sed interpretationis lege atque necessitate, utique illius que non ad sensum sit sed ad verbum.”

⁷¹ See Bentley, *Humanists and Holy Writ*, pp. 51–53.

⁷² Valla, *Collatio*, pp. XXI–XXII, where Perosa reports that 130 of Valla’s Vulgate citations and “circa una quarantina” of his Greek citations out of 380 citations (Perosa gives this number for the Latin citations, but the Greek citations must be approximately the same) diverge from the modern accepted text.

recension, that is, the contemporary Byzantine text, rather than the superior Alexandrian text recovered in modern times.⁷³ Despite these handicaps, Valla's biblical criticism was revolutionary precisely because it was seriously philological as he consistently and in detailed fashion collated the Latin text with the Greek. By comparison, for instance, the commentary of the great fourteenth-century Hebraist Nicholas of Lyra is remarkably unphilological, even in the Old Testament, where his knowledge of Hebrew should have suggested more philological criticism. Indeed, the *Additiones* to Nicholas's commentary made by the early fifteenth-century Jewish convert Paul of Burgos have more of a philological tinge.⁷⁴ Medieval Hebraists were certainly well aware of some fundamental philological principles—Nicholas Maniacutia's treatise *Suffraganeus Bibliothecae* is a good example of such awareness⁷⁵—but none ever published a collation of the Vulgate with the Hebrew, let alone of the Septuagint with the Hebrew.

Pace those who stress Valla's polemics with Poggio Bracciolini,⁷⁶ the *Collatio* did not in fact provoke much contemporary controversy. Only at four points in 64 pages of anti-Vallian invective, and then only briefly each time, did Poggio touch on the *Collatio*, and in all instances, Poggio did hardly more than express outrage at Valla's audacity to treat Jerome as ignorant of Latin.⁷⁷

More interesting is the criticism of George of Trebizond, who, unlike Poggio, actually was proficient in Greek. But even here George

⁷³ On these text types see Metzger and Ehrman, *Text of the New Testament*, pp. 276–80.

⁷⁴ I consulted *Biblia Latina cum postillis Nicolai de Lyra et... additionibus Pauli Burgensis replicisque Matthiae Doering*, 4 vols., Venice: [Bonetus Locatellus for] Octavianus Scotus, 4 August 1489 (Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke, 4291). I sampled several sections. Nicholas would note that something was said *more Hebraici sermonis*, but he did not normally go into any detail about the Hebrew text. In his *Annotationes* in this edition, Paul of Burgos referred relatively more to the *littera Hebraica* of the text. In the same edition, Matthias Döring, OFM (1390/1400–1469), refuted Paul's criticisms of Nicholas.

⁷⁵ See n. 25 above.

⁷⁶ Erasmus himself started this line of argument in the preface to his edition of Valla's *Annotationes*; see n. 39 above. Valla gave over much more space to defending his *Collatio* than did Poggio in criticizing it. See Camporeale, *Lorenzo Valla*, ch. III, pp. 207–403, *passim*. Ari Wesseling provides a handy synopsis and chronology of the Valla-Poggio debate in L. Valla, *Antidotum Primum: La prima apologia contro Poggio Bracciolini*, ed. A. Wesseling (Amsterdam, 1978), pp. 25–39.

⁷⁷ See Poggio Bracciolini, *Opera Omnia*, 1, ed. Riccardo Fubini (Turin, 1964–69), 199–200 (*Invectiva I*), 210 (*Invectiva II*), 231 (*ibid.*), where Poggio also claims that Valla warned that he held in reserve darts [*spiculae*] to throw at Christ, and 248 (*Invectiva V*). Poggio's five invectives cover pp. 188–251.

attacked not so much Valla but Cardinal Bessarion, Valla's supporter and George's great nemesis.⁷⁸ The issue in question was the translation of Christ's question in John 21:22 concerning John the Baptist (*ean auton thelo menein heos erchomai, ti pros se?*), "If I wish him to remain until I return, what is it to you?" The Vulgate reads *sic* ("thus"), as does the Old Latin version, rather than *si* ("if") so that the sense of the question becomes: "I thus wish him to remain, etc.?" Valla ignored the passage in the *Collatio*, but noted the problem in the *Annotationes* after, as he himself tells us, it had been pointed out to him by Cardinal Bessarion.⁷⁹ In 1450/51 in Rome, George of Trebizond published a treatise vigorously defending the correctness of *sic* because he believed that Christ was here declaring that John would remain until Christ's Second Coming. Citing Augustine, George correctly showed that *sic* was the rendering of the Old Latin and then argued that Jerome was right to preserve this rendering because it conveyed the true sense of the passage.⁸⁰ Bessarion objected to such an interpretation, and after George refused to retract his words, wrote a treatise in which he sought to show that Jerome must have written *si* and that *sic* was a scribal corruption.⁸¹ Bessarion made large use of Nicholas Maniacutia's explanation in the *Suffraganeus Bibliothecae* of how scribal corruptions crept into a text. George subsequently wrote a response to Bessarion's critique addressed to Pope Paul II

⁷⁸ In 1450 in Rome George and Valla competed as teachers of rhetoric; see John Monfasani, *George of Trebizond: A Biography and a Study of His Rhetoric and Logic* (Leiden, 1976), pp. 82–83. In a letter of 1469 to Bessarion, George attacked Valla and his *theologia*, but he never mentioned the *Collatio*; see John Monfasani, *Collectanea Trapezuntiana*, p. 165, § 12. In his *Protectio Aristotelis* of 1457, George acknowledged that the issue of John 21:22 was being discussed, but in words that suggest a prelate such as Bessarion rather than Valla; see Ludwig Mohler, *Cardinal Bessarion*, 3 (1923–42; repr. Aalen-Paderborn, 1967), 330.16–18: "Hanc enim inter summae dignitatis viros aut certo summae proximos contentionem fuisse nuper audiui."

⁷⁹ See Valla, *Opera Omnia* 1, p. 340 (*Antidotum in Poggium IV*): "Nam Cardinalis Nicanus...ut adderem admonuit"; and *ibid.*, p. 846 (*Annotationes*).

⁸⁰ See Monfasani, *George of Trebizond*, pp. 90–101; and *idem*, *Collectanea Trapezuntiana*, pp. 169–70 (Text XXXVI, §§ 30–31), 311–12 (Text CIV), and 574–76 (Text CXLVI).

⁸¹ For the original Greek text see Mohler, *Cardinal Bessarion*, 3, 70–87; for Bessarion's own Latin version, see Jacques-Paul Migne, ed., *Patrologiae Cursus Completus. Series Graeca* (Paris, 1857–66), 161:623–40. Bessarion insisted upon the *Graeca veritas*; see *ibid.*, 630B: "Libros autem Novi Testamenti, siquid in Latinis varietatibus titubat, Graecis cedere oportere non dubium est." He then proceeded to give eight instances where the Vulgate has been corrupted and needs to be corrected. In five instances, what Bessarion called a corruption is in fact the true text of the Vulgate (John 19:27; John 18:28; Matt. 25:1; 1 Tim. 6:9; 1 Tim. 4:9), and in three others he correctly identified a corruption (John 1:13; 1 Cor. 10:17; 2 Cor. 8:24).

(1464–71).⁸² What is especially interesting about this debate is, first, that contrary to what we might have expected, modern scholarship agrees with George on the narrower philological point, that the *sic* of the Vulgate is not an a scribal error, but reflects Jerome's text;⁸³ and second, on the broader exegetical issue, modern scholarship even lends George some support, recognizing that the "if" of the passage (*ean*) could indeed be interpreted as "if as is to be expected" and needs the denial shortly afterwards in v. 23 to be safeguarded against as the true reading.⁸⁴ In short, to a limited degree the Old Latin and the Vulgate genuinely reflect a defensible exegetical reading of the Greek.

One of the most famous humanists of his time,⁸⁵ Giannozzo Manetti (1396–1459) was in fact, though not in influence, a more revolutionary biblical scholar than Lorenzo Valla. Unlike Valla's *Annotationes*, Manetti's translations never found an Erasmus to publicize them.⁸⁶ Despite a generally more conservative outlook than Valla,⁸⁷ Manetti did more than note problems in the Vulgate text of the New Testament when compared to the Greek; he actually produced a new translation of

⁸² Found in *Patrologia Graeca*, 161:867–882; see Monfasani, *George of Trebizond*, 97–101; and idem, *Collectanea Trapezuntiana*, pp. 574–76.

⁸³ For the literature see Monfasani, *George of Trebizond*, p. 92, n. 103.

⁸⁴ Ibid., p. 93, no. 104. The quotation is from F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament*, tr. R. Funk, 9th ed. (Cambridge-Chicago, 1961), p. 190.

⁸⁵ For his life and work, up-to-date information is to be had from Anna Modigliani in Manetti, *Vita Nicolai Quinti*, pp. xxviii–xxxvii; and G. Manetti, *Biographical Writings*, ed. and tr., Stefano U. Baldassarri and Rolf Bagemihl (Cambridge, MA – London, 2003), pp. vii–xix (by Baldassarri). Both overlook Christoph Dröge, "Zur Idee der Menschenwürde in Giannozzo Manettis *Protesti di Giustizia*," *Wolfenbütteler Renaissance-Mitteilungen* 14 (1990), 109–23. On Manetti's fame, now see also idem, "The Pope's Favorite Humanist in the Land of the Reformation: On the Reception of the Works of Giannozzo Manetti in Sixteenth-Century Germany and France," in Rhoda Schnur et al., eds., *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Bariensis: Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies* (Tempe, AZ, 1998), pp. 217–24.

⁸⁶ Manetti never published his translations. No edition exists. The only extant manuscripts of the translation of the New Testament are Manetti's own, Pal. Lat. 45 of the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana (= BAV), and that of Federigo of Montefeltro, Urb. Lat. 6 of the BAV. See Garofalo, "Umanisti italiani," p. 364. There are only three extant manuscripts of the translation of the Psalms: the dedication copy to Alfonso V in BAV, Pal. Lat. 40, which seems never to have been presented; BAV, Urb. Lat. 5, copied by Agnolo Manetti; and MS 1074 of the Bibliothèque royale, Brussels; plus a fragment in MS C 336 of the Biblioteca Marucelliana, Florence; see Trinkaus, "In Our Image and Likeness," 2, p. 818 n. 53.

⁸⁷ On Manetti's relative conservatism, see Fubini, *L'Umanesimo italiano*, pp. 114–19; and Baldassarri in Manetti, *Biographical Writings*, pp. xii–xv.

the whole New Testament into Latin from the Greek.⁸⁸ Not stopping there, he proposed to make as well a new Latin translation of the Old Testament from the Hebrew.⁸⁹ He only got as far as completing his translation of the Psalms before his patron Pope Nicholas V died in 1455.⁹⁰ He made no further progress on the project in the remaining four years of his life, but in defense of his Psalms translation he did produce as part of his *Apologeticus* a remarkable catalogue of the additions, omissions, and changes in the Septuagint version of the Psalms as compared to the Hebrew original. In essence, Manetti had created a work of philological *annotationes* on the Psalms in a consistent, methodological manner. Furthermore, in clear imitation of Origen's *Hexapla* and in anticipation of Giovanni Crastone's 1481 *Psalterium Graeco-Latinum* and Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples' 1509 *Quincuplex Psalterium*,⁹¹ Manetti prepared a version of his translation that presented in three parallel columns his own translation, Jerome's two translations of the Psalms, from the Septuagint and from the Hebrew.

Manetti tells us that it was Pope Nicholas V who asked him to translate the Bible.⁹² We know that he completed his rendering of the Psalms in 1454–55. Upon Nicholas V's death, Manetti transferred to the Neapolitan court of King Alfonso the Magnanimous, to whom he dedicated both his translation of the Psalms and then, a year later (1456) his *Apologeticus*. Next, instead of continuing with the Old Testament, he turned to the New Testament, completing his translation before 1459, the year of his death. Manetti had embarked on his translation of the Bible only in the last five years of his life. One can only guess

⁸⁸ On this translation see Garofalo, "Umanisti italiani," pp. 364–65; Bentley, *Humanists and Holy Writ*, pp. 57–59; and Trinkaus, "In Our Image and Likeness," 2, pp. 573–78.

⁸⁹ Garofalo, "Umanisti italiani," p. 358, n. 4, notes that the secondary literature speaks of the fourteenth-century Benedictine Adam Easton having translated the Bible from the Hebrew. But Margaret Harvey, *The English in Rome, 1362–1420: Portrait of an Expatriate Community* (Cambridge, 1999), pp. 230–34, shows that Easton's knowledge of Hebrew was limited, and makes no suggestion that he translated the Bible.

⁹⁰ In addition to Garofalo, "Umanisti italiani," pp. 358–64; and Trinkaus, "In Our Image and Likeness," 581–96; see especially Christoph Dröge, *Giannozzo Manetti als Denker und Hebraist* (Frankfurt am Main, 1987); and idem, "'Quia morem Hieronymi in transferendo cognovi...': Les débuts des études hébraïques chez les humanistes italiens," in Ilana Zinguer, ed., *L'Hebreu au temps de la Renaissance* (Leiden, 1992), pp. 65–88, at pp. 72–79.

⁹¹ See Lucia Gualdo Rosa, "Crastone (Crastoni, Craston, Crestone, Crestoni), Giovanni," in *Dizionario biografico degli italiani* 30 (1984), 578–80; and for Lefèvre, Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, pp. 192–201.

⁹² Manetti, *De Vita ac Gestis Nicolai V*, p. 66.

whether he would have rendered the whole Old Testament as well as the New Testament into Latin if he and his patrons had lived longer. (King Alfonso died in 1458, three years after Nicholas V.) But one may also wonder if Manetti would have translated the Bible at all if not for Nicholas V's commission. Manetti's friend and admirer Vespasiano da Bisticci tells us that Manetti first learned Hebrew, not to translate but to be able to read the Old Testament in the original language in order to refute Jews.⁹³ As Vespasiano also tells us, Manetti was "a most vehement disputant, and he was keen to dispute with Jews."⁹⁴ Not surprisingly, therefore, already in the later 1440s, well before he turned to translating the Bible, Manetti had started writing his large treatise *Adversus Iudeos et Gentes*.⁹⁵

Contra Bentley,⁹⁶ I agree with Riccardo Fubini that Manetti seems to have had a copy of Valla's *Annotationes* at hand.⁹⁷ Garofalo also came to the same conclusion.⁹⁸ In translating the New Testament, however, Manetti was selective in following Valla's recommendations.⁹⁹ Even

⁹³ *Vite*, 1:25: "Imparò la lingua ebraica . . . per avere peritia della Iscrittura Sancta, et per confusione degli Ebrei, contro a' quali egli voleva iscrivere, e compse una opera [i.e., *Adversus Iudaeos et Gentes*]." Dröge, "Quia morem," p. 71; idem, "Zur Idee," pp. 118–20 (specifically on the dignity of Man); and idem, *Giannozzo Manetti*, pp. 18–20, suggests that the Venetian patrician Marco Lippomano (ca. 1390–after 17 July 1446), who was apparently the first humanist to learn Hebrew in addition to Greek, inspired Manetti to learn Hebrew. In his *Adv. Iudaeos et Gentes*, Manetti did praise Lippomano for his *in Graeca et in Hebraea facultate* (Manetti, *Biographical Writings*, p. 156); on Lippomano, see Margaret L. King, *Venetian Humanism in an Age of Patrician Dominance* (Princeton, 1986), p. 389 *et ad indicem*.

⁹⁴ Ibid.: "Era veementissimo disputatore, et volentieri disputava co' Giudei."

⁹⁵ He mentioned the work in a letter to Nicholas V of 4 May 1448; concerning the dating of this work see Alfonso De Petris, "L'«Adversus Iudeos et Gentes» di Giannozzo Manetti," *Rinascimento*, ser. II, 16 (1976), 193–205, at 193–94.

⁹⁶ Bentley, *Humanists and Holy Writ*, p. 58: "there is no sign that the men cooperated or collaborated in their work, nor even any evidence that Manetti consulted Valla's notes to the New Testament."

⁹⁷ Fubini, *L'Umanesimo italiano*, pp. 116, 182. Trinkaus, "In Our Image and Likeness", 2, pp. 573–78, presents the evidence I am about to cite, but was doubtful about direct influence. At Rom. 1:20, Valla recommended (*Opera*, 1:856; not in the *Collatio*) *operibus* or *factis*, for the Vulgate's *ea quae facta sunt*, and Manetti translated *ex operibus factis*. At 2 Cor. 8:19, Valla recommended (ibid., p. 873; not in the *Collatio*) *promptitudinem* or *alacritatem* for the Vulgate's *voluntatem*, and Manetti translated *promptitudinem*.

⁹⁸ Garofalo, "Umanisti italiani," p. 364: "Da un attento esame condotto a titolo di saggio sulla versione della lettera ai Romani, risultano, accanto a identità non casuali di traduzioni, significative indipendenze."

⁹⁹ See the previous note, and Trinkaus, "In Our Image and Likeness," 2, pp. 573–77, for instances where Manetti did not follow Valla; see also Bentley, *Humanists and Holy Writ*, pp. 58–59.

where he agreed with Valla that the Vulgate was in error, his solution could be different and even more radical.¹⁰⁰ He also corrected the Vulgate against the Greek in places overlooked by Valla. For instance, at Acts 2:43, he dropped *in Ierusalem* added by the Vulgate;¹⁰¹ at Mk. 15:40, he dropped *et Ioseph* added by the Vulgate;¹⁰² and at Acts 28:8 and 16 he correctly translated *civitas Lasca* and *Clauda* (vs. the *Thalassa* and *Cauda* of the Vulgate).¹⁰³ But my impression from a sampling of passages where the Vulgate diverges from the Greek is that overall Manetti acted conservatively, usually preserving the reading of the Vulgate, most notably in the case of the already mentioned *comma Johanneum* (1 John 5:8). In translating the Psalms, on the other hand, as Garofalo tells us, Manetti consistently followed the Hebrew text against the Vulgate (and, therefore, against the Septuagint).¹⁰⁴ Indeed, for some verses, Manetti's Latin coincides with the modern Latin version of the Istituto Biblico in Rome.¹⁰⁵ As Garofalo noted apropos the Psalms¹⁰⁶ and Bentley apropos the New Testament,¹⁰⁷ Manetti, like Valla, believed that the Bible should be rendered in a Latin more refined and correct than that of the Vulgate.

Manetti had only one worthy successor in the Quattrocento: Giovanni Pico della Mirandola. True, Giovanni Crastone (c. 1415–1490) published a Greek-Latin Psalter in 1481, in which he vigorously defended his new translation.¹⁰⁸ But the fact remains that Crastone translated exclusively from the Septuagint, which was a step back from Manetti's

¹⁰⁰ See Bentley, *Humanists and Holy Writ*, p. 59, concerning 1 Cor. 15:51, where Manetti "presented a conflated and self-contradictory version." See Trinkaus, "In Our Image and Likeness," 2, p. 575, concerning 1 Cor. 2:13: Manetti presented "a still more radical solution."

¹⁰¹ I consult the copy in MS Urb. Lat. 6 of the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, in this case, at fol. 189r.

¹⁰² Ibid., fol. 52r.

¹⁰³ Ibid., fol. 220v.

¹⁰⁴ Garofalo, "Umanisti italiani," p. 363: "è condotta fedelissimamente sul testo originale."

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., p. 364. Dröge, *Gianozzo Manetti*, concludes that Manetti's translation was an independent translation that took a middle road between a literal and a free version (pp. 48–49).

¹⁰⁶ Ibid.: "Un umanista come Gianozzo non poteva fare a meno di sfoggiare buon gusto latino."

¹⁰⁷ Bentley, *Humanists and Holy Writ*, p. 59.

¹⁰⁸ See n. 91 above. His preface is available in Botfield, *Prefationes*, pp. 13–16. Crastone did not mention Valla or Manetti, and argued that he was correcting scribal corruptions rather than mistakes of Jerome.

collation of the Septuagint with the Hebrew, and his fresh translation of the Psalms from the Hebrew.

Another exceptionally able expert in Greek who tried his hand at biblical scholarship was none other than the Platonic philosopher Marsilio Ficino (1433–1499). Ordained a priest in 1473, he wrote a defense of Christianity (*De Christiana Religione*) the next year. In the last years of his life he lectured publicly in Florence on Paul and planned to publish a commentary on all the Epistles,¹⁰⁹ but in the event he only wrote (in 1497) an incomplete commentary on Romans.¹¹⁰ Seeking to penetrate, as he said in the preface, the *arcana mysteria* of the “sublime” Paul,¹¹¹ Ficino called upon Plato (*noster Plato*, to use his words), Porphyry, Iamblichus, Orpheus, and Zoroaster as well as St. Augustine and Thomas Aquinas for authoritative explanation. Though quite orthodox in content, stressing that God weighs *opera*, not *personae*¹¹² and that the promise to Abraham is fulfilled not in the Law but in faith and grace,¹¹³ Ficino illustrated how beautifully Plato’s *pia philosophia* opened up to us the *arcana mysteria* of Christianity. *En passant*, he offered only one trivial alternative rendering, *nequitia* for the Vulgate’s *malitia* at Rom. 1:29 (Greek: *poneria*)¹¹⁴ and discussed at two points the nuances of a Greek word.¹¹⁵ So, despite his Greek erudition, Ficino stuck to exegesis and eschewed philology.¹¹⁶

Giovanni Pico della Mirandola (1463–1494) learned Hebrew as he dived into the mysteries of the Cabala; but even before the fiasco of his failed Roman disputation in 1487, where he would have synthesized all intellectual systems, Pico seems to have already turned to working directly on the text of the Bible. In 1486–8–89, with the aid of the

¹⁰⁹ See Paul O. Kristeller, *Supplementum Ficinianum*, 1 (Florence, 1937), p. lxxxii.

¹¹⁰ To be read in Marsilio Ficino, *Opera Omnia*, 1 (Turin, 1962), pp. 425–72/455–502. For the date of 1497, see Paul O. Kristeller, *Marsilio Ficino and His Work after Five Hundred Years* (Florence, 1987), p. 123; and Sebastiano Gentile, Sandra Niccoli, and Paolo Viti, *Marsilio Ficino e il ritorno di Platone: Manoscritti, stampe e documenti, 17 maggio—16 giugno 1984* (Florence, 1984), pp. 155 and 158. For its incomplete state, we have the fact that it ends abruptly in Rom. 5:12 and that the printed edition carries the colophon: “Plura inveniri non potuerunt.”

¹¹¹ *Opera* 1, pp. 425/455: “arcana sublimis Pauli mysteria percepturi.”

¹¹² *Ibid.*, p. 449/479.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 466/496.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 442–43/473–74.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 437/467 for *kathoratai* in Rom. 1:20; and p. 470/500 for *agape* in Rom. 5:5.

¹¹⁶ For a discussion of Ficino’s exegesis, see Trinkaus, “*In Our Image and Likeness*”, 2, pp. 744–53. For a recent discussion of Ficino’s approach to Christianity, see Thomas Leinkauf, “Philosophie und Religion bei Marsilio Ficino,” *Accademia* 4 (2002), 29–57.

Jewish convert Flavius Mithridates, Pico essayed a revision, with commentary, of the first ten chapters of the Vulgate version of Job.¹¹⁷ More importantly, he left at his death a commentary on eight Psalms.¹¹⁸ Pico opened six of his eight *Expositiones in Psalmos* with a philological section in which he compared the Septuagint, the Hebrew, the Vulgate, and the Gallican Psalter as he sought to justify the Septuagint against its Jewish critics.¹¹⁹ In this section as well as in the commentary proper he also revealed a serious engagement with Jewish commentators on the Psalms. Far more traditional, on the other hand, was Pico's commentary. Allegory with a heavily Neoplatonic flavour dominated, even if Pico also attended to the other three of the traditional four senses (literal, anagogical, and moral) and threw in an fifth sense (physical) to boot.¹²⁰ More disappointing, despite its fame, was the one major biblical work Pico did publish (in 1489), the *Heptaplus*.¹²¹ The *Heptaplus* was an esoteric decoding of Genesis using an allegorical key inspired by Proclus, Pseudo-Dionysius, the Cabala, and other Jewish sources. As Crofton Black puts it, "Pico's *Heptaplus* was already outdated before it was composed."¹²²

¹¹⁷ Chaim Wirszubski, "Giovanni Pico's Book of Job," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 32 (1969), 171–99, at p. 172, proposed that Pico translated the first ten chapters and had Mithradites do the rest; but Crofton Black, *Pico's Heptaplus and Biblical Hermeneutics* (Leiden, 2006), pp. 22–23, persuasively argues that Mithradites oversaw his efforts at translating the first ten chapters and then took over alone for the remaining thirty-two chapters.

¹¹⁸ The commentary on six of the eight survives in a single manuscript, Ottob. Lat. 607 of the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. All eight commentaries have been published in a modern edition: Antonino Raspanti, ed., *Expositiones in Psalmos*, trans. Antonino Raspanti and Giacomo Raspanti (Florence, 1997).

¹¹⁹ See Black, *Pico's Heptaplus*, pp. 84–88.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 88–91.

¹²¹ The standard edition remains that by Eugenio Garin with an Italian translation: *De Hominis Dignitate. Heptaplus. De Ente et Uno* (Florence, 1942). An English translation by Douglas Carmichael is to be had in *Pico Della Mirandola, On the Dignity of Man. On Being and the One. Heptaplus*, introd. Paul J.W. Miller (Indianapolis, 1965), pp. 63–174.

¹²² Black, *Pico's Heptaplus*, p. 237. Black continues: "and Pico's reliance on the structure of the ontological and epistemological hierarchy anchors the work firmly in pre-Renaissance thinking." I may note here that on the basis of the *Heptaplus*, Black, p. 236, implicitly repudiates the overarching thesis of Trinkaus's "*In Our Image and Likeness*", i.e., "that Pico's vision of philosophy, emerging from its scholastic cocoon and taking flight on the wings of man's newly fledged dignity, is a potent symbol of the transition from Middle Ages to Renaissance." Of little worth is Vico Allegretti, *Ezegezi medievale e umanesimo: L'Heptaplus di Giovanni Pico della Mirandola* (Ravenna, 1997). On the hermeneutics of Pico, however, Trinkaus quite agrees with Black; see his "L'Heptaplus di Pico della Mirandola: Compendio tematico e concordanza del suo pensiero," in Gian Carlo Garfagnini, ed., *Giovanni Pico della Mirandola: Convegno internazionale di studi nel*

Another humanist who commented on Genesis was the Venetian patrician Candiano Bollani (ca. 1413–1478).¹²³ Divided into eighteen books and still extant only in manuscript, Bollani's commentary treated the first three chapters of Genesis.¹²⁴ Bollani also wrote a still unedited commentary on the Magnificat.¹²⁵ Since he was demonstrably skilled in Greek,¹²⁶ his biblical work could be of some interest if investigated.

We are more fortunate in the case of the Sienese scholar Pietro de' Rossi (d. 1459), whose commentary on the whole Old Testament (save for the Psalms),¹²⁷ titled "Veteris Testamenti atque Sententiarum nec non Aristotelis Ethicorum Concordia" and extant only in manuscript, has been studied by Gianfranco Fioravanti.¹²⁸ Rossi knew Hebrew,¹²⁹ but his work was hardly an exercise in philology. Rather, as its title suggests, the "Concordia" aimed to discover in the Old Testament the teachings of Aristotle's *Ethics* and Peter Lombard's *Sentences*. It was also a work of apologetics, defending the Christian reading of the Old Testament against the contrary interpretation of the Jews. So, even though his references to the Talmud and Jewish authorities equal or exceed those to Aristotle, Rossi resorted to Hebrew and Hebrew literature "completely within the controversialist tradition" without philological preoccupations, let alone any interest in the Cabala.¹³⁰

Even when quattrocento humanists did not apply their philological knowledge to the text of the Bible, some applied their literary skill to its adaptation. Maffeo Vegio (1407–1458), for instance, recast the

cinquecentesimo anniversario della morte (1494–1994: Mirandola, 4–8 ottobre 1994) (Florence, 1997), pp. 105–23 (reprinted in his *Renaissance Transformations of Late Medieval Thought* [Aldershot, 1999], as Essay XII), at p. 116: "In altri termini, Pico ammette che tutto il suo modo di esporre è allegorico, o «spirituale»."

¹²³ See G. Pillinini, "Bollani (Bolani, Bollanus, Bolanus), Candiano," *Dizionario biografico degli italiani* 11 (1967), 287–89.

¹²⁴ MS Lat. I, 44 (= 2038) of the Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana in Venice; see *Bibliotheca Manuscripta ad S. Marci Venetiarum*, 1 (Venice, 1868–73), pp. 212–13 (cl. I, no. 27); Kristeller, *Iter Italicum*, 2, p. 216.

¹²⁵ See Kristeller, *Iter Italicum*, 4, p. 160, for MS Harl. 2058, fols. 24v–339r, of the British Library.

¹²⁶ He translated into Latin George of Trebizond's long Greek letter to John Cuboclesius on the procession of the Holy Spirit; see Monfasani, *George of Trebizond*, p. 23; and idem, *Collectanea Trapezuntiana*, pp. 24–24, 255, and 260–61.

¹²⁷ But he intended to make good this omission; see Fioravanti, "Bibbia ed Aristotele nella Siena del '400" p. 89/57, end of n. 2.

¹²⁸ See *ibid.* Rossi's work survives in MSS F. III. 8–9 of the Biblioteca Comunale degli Intronati in Siena; see Kristeller, *Iter Italicum*, 2, p. 152.

¹²⁹ See n. 28 above.

¹³⁰ Fioravanti, "Bibbia ed Aristotele nella Siena del '400," pp. 114–15/82–83.

Penitential Psalms into classical Latin elegiacs.¹³¹ Angelo Poliziano (1454–1494) went Vegio one better and recast the Greek text of the Our Father into the dactylic hexameters of the Homeric epics.¹³² Aurelio Lippo Brandolini (ca. 1454–1497) attempted an even more substantial literary recasting.¹³³ His *Epithomae in sacram Iudeorum historiam ex volumine quam Bibliam appellant et Josephi, historico fidelissimo* remade the Old Testament story into an elegant humanist history, conflating, as the title indicates, Josephus and the Bible. Brandolini's history enjoyed minimal circulation,¹³⁴ but his defense of it in his preface has received some attention in modern times as a justification for "the humanist as a biblical scholar."¹³⁵ In point of fact, it is hardly more than an apology along the lines of Cicero's *De Oratore*, arguing for rhetoric's value as a way to reach a wide audience and for Brandolini's right as a skilled Latinist to recast scripture into elegant prose. Brandolini nowhere makes philological, let alone theological, claims for his humanist expertise as Valla had previously and as later Erasmus would make. Only once, and almost fleetingly, does he refer to what could have been his strongest argument, that is, the historical value of collating data from Josephus with what is found in the Bible.¹³⁶ In short, Brandolini's rhetorical outlook trumped the scientific arguments for his enterprise.

Quattrocento humanism did not transform the study of Scripture any more than it did the study of other disciplinary areas outside of profane Latin and Greek literature and language; but it did lay the groundwork for such a transformation in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as humanism penetrated into almost all aspects of Western educated culture. In a sense, the sixteenth century caught up with the fifteenth when Erasmus's fortuitously discovered Lorenzo Valla's *Annotationes*. But even before this discovery Erasmus was already culturally

¹³¹ See Garofalo, "Umanisti italiani," p. 365.

¹³² See Guido Cortassi, "Angelo Poliziano: 'Padre nostro'," in *Il sacro nel Rinascimento: Atti del XII Convegno internazionale (Chianciano-Pienza, 17–20 luglio 2000)* (Florence, 2002), pp. 395–404. As Cortassi points out, in several verses Poliziano was closely following the poetry of St. Gregory Nazianzen.

¹³³ See Antonio Rotondò, "Brandolini, Aurelio Lippo," *Dizionario biografico degli italiani* 14 (1972), 26–28; Trinkaus, "In Our Image and Likeness", 2, pp. 601–13; and Erika Rummel, "In Defense of 'Theologizing Humanists': Aurelio Brandolini's 'In Sacram Ebreorum Historiam... Prefatio'," *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 44 (1995), 90–106.

¹³⁴ Rotondò, "Brandolini," p. 28, lists three manuscripts.

¹³⁵ The phrase is from Trinkaus's rubric at 2:601. Rummel edits the preface.

¹³⁶ Rummel, "Theologizing Humanists," p. 93. He gave over a mere seven lines out of approximately 325 to making this point.

a child of the Italian Quattrocento, just as were the editors of the Complutensian Bible. The Italian quattrocento led the way in Renaissance biblical scholarship not only in particular instances, but also in the broader sense of changing the intellectual conditions that would make such scholarship possible.

ERASMUS, THE INTELLECTUALS, AND THE REUCHLIN AFFAIR

Daniel Ménager

(trans. by Anna Machado-Matheson)

I

In Western Europe, intellectuals do not have good press in our time. They are generally reproached for being conservative and critical, for assessing everything without possessing the technical expertise that would permit them to speak authoritatively, and for meddling in matters that do not concern them. And for good measure, the prediction is added that intellectuals are a dying breed. Popular trends in this part of the world do not help their case. Intellectuals dare not leave the ivory tower, says the stock phrase of certain politicians. They are not aware of the “realities” going on in “the world below.” Of course, the authors of these criticisms appear to have forgotten that some intellectuals have courageously gone to Afghanistan or Kosovo to see with their own eyes what transpired there. Reality has different meanings for different people! For the modern populist, reality is found only in old villages in France or, in the best of cases, the problem areas of large cities.

Such criticism is hardly novel. Sartre examined the phenomenon in three lectures he delivered in Japan in 1965 and published under the title *Plaidoyer pour les Intellectuels*,¹ and similar populist sentiments appear already in the writings of Dreyfus’ adversaries, who first coined the term “intellectual.” The single greatest mistake made by intellectuals, they said, was to occupy themselves with matters that did not pertain to them.² If they specialized in science, they should stick to science. If they were attached to the Church, they should stick to clerical matters. If they were men of letters, they should concern themselves with the birth dates of writers and the editions of their works. It is probable that a good number of the criticisms summarized here were formulated well before the twentieth century in a different guise. This raises the

¹ Jean-Paul Sartre, *Plaidoyer pour les Intellectuels* (Paris, 1972).

² *Ibid.*, pp. 12–13.

question: in what historical period did intellectuals first appear on the scene? In the eighteenth century? This claim has often been made, and not without reason. But could we go back a little further without running the risk of falling into the great “sin of anachronism”?³ This taboo was broken by one of our greatest historians, Jacques Le Goff (and, incidentally, a true intellectual himself), and shows the bold approach necessary to promote a better understanding of history. In fact, according to Le Goff, the Middle Ages had its intellectuals, that is to say, clerics “whose profession it was to think and to impart their thinking.”⁴ They did not scorn entering into a battle of ideas and did not consider it beneath themselves to descend into the arena for or against Aristotle, for or against Abélard, for or against the *Roman de la Rose*. The site of their activities was the city, which, from the twelfth century onwards, experienced unprecedented progress. It was a fortunate period in history, if we accept the eminent medievalist’s judgment, for all, or almost all, would soon change with the Renaissance.⁵ The Renaissance humanist wanted an end to the commotion in the universities and the fierce disputations of the clerics. He desired tranquillity. In A. Chastel’s description,⁶ one finds the intellectual in his study, surrounded by books and guarded either by a somnolent dog or, when he is an incarnation of Saint Jerome, by a harmless lion. He does not raise his eyes from the page he reads, from the sheet he writes on, except to follow the trajectory of his thoughts or the flight of a bird outside. Baudelairian before the term existed, he adores calm and luxury. What would he do surrounded by the fury of the world?

Erasmus, too, enjoyed quietude, the *otium* of scholars. Yet as the most prominent intellectual of his time, he refused to confine himself to one particular specialty and considered it his duty to involve himself in matters that, at first glance, were none of his concern. However, his enterprise placed him in a bit of a quandary. Erasmus had become a doctor of theology rather late in life⁷ and, as J. Chomarat specifies,

³ Lucien Lefebvre, *Le Problème de l’incroyance au XVI^e siècle. La religion de Rabelais*, rev. ed. (Paris, 1947), p. 53.

⁴ See Jacques Le Goff, *Les Intellectuels au Moyen Âge* (Paris, 1960), p. 4.

⁵ See the conclusion, as delightful as it is disputable, of this book (Le Goff, *Les Intellectuels*, pp. 187–88).

⁶ André Chastel, *Le Mythe de la Renaissance* (Geneva, 1969), pp. 167–75.

⁷ He was about forty years old. Leon-Ernest Halkin, *Érasme parmi nous* (Paris, 1987), p. 103.

“at a second-rate university.”⁸ According to that historian, Erasmus did not accord much importance to this title. There is certainly no shortage of texts to show his reluctance to vaunt his title, such as the following statement, which did not escape Chomarat’s notice: “There is nothing I would claim for myself less than being a professional theologian, even though at the insistence of certain of my friends I long ago enrolled in their rank. Where in my writings do I boast of being a theologian? Who has ever heard me at any time congratulate myself on that title, even in casual conversation?”⁹ At best, the theologian constructs systems, he said. He often focuses on trifles that do not serve to advance the love of God. Erasmus therefore prefers to think of himself as a philologist; he scrutinizes in detail the letter of Scripture, for there are no trifling details where the Divine Word is concerned. His aim is (to return to the words and ideas of J. Chomarat) to promote a renaissance of true theology “founded on the knowledge of Scripture and in the service of piety.”¹⁰

Thus Erasmus lays claim not to the title, but to the discourse of the theologian. One of the most interesting examples of this is found in the prefatory letter to the *Education of a Christian Prince* (March 1516), where we read: “I am a theologian addressing a renowned and upright prince.” In this sentence Erasmus compares his work with that of Isocrates, an ancient Greek author who endeavoured to portray the ideal prince. We can do better, Erasmus appears to say, when we adopt the point of view of Christian theology. The conclusion of the sentence raises some questions: “I am a theologian, addressing a renowned and upright prince: Christians both of us.”¹¹ What does this emphasis imply? Too close a reading might lead us to think that not all theologians are truly Christian, a notion already intimated in certain sections of *The Praise of Folly*, where unkind remarks about theologians are put into the mouth of Dame Folly. But here, it is Erasmus himself who speaks candidly. Of course, in this passage as in others, Erasmus presents a broader point of view and speaks not merely as a theologian. It is in this sense,

⁸ I.e., the University of Turin. See Jacques Chomarat, *Grammaire et rhétorique chez Erasme* (Paris, 1981), p. 17.

⁹ Erasmus, *Apology against Jacques Lefèvre D’Étaples*, in CWE 83, p. 106.

¹⁰ Translating Chomarat, *Grammaire et rhétorique*, p. 20.

¹¹ Erasmus, Ep. 393 addressed to Charles of Brabant (the future Charles V), in CWE 3, pp. 247–50. All letters by Erasmus cited (with the exception of 1527) are from this translation. The Latin reads “ego theologus inclitum et integerrimum principem; ad haec Christianus Christianum” (Allen 2, p. 207).

to a certain extent, that he dares to write in the *Paraclesis*: “The man who preaches these and other similar virtues under the inspiration of Christ, who teaches them by exhortation, invitation and leadership, is the only authentic theologian, even if he is an unskilled labourer or weaver.”¹² No doubt this enraged all theologians who were proud of their expertise! One could say, moreover, that this point of view is not far removed from that of Luther and his concept of the priesthood of all believers. Yet this is not the case at all. One must not forget the well-known passage in which Erasmus, writing to Paul Volz,¹³ presents the hierarchy of the Christian order. At the centre of the world is Christ, surrounded by three estates. In the first circle, the one nearest to his divine person, we see the priests, bishops, cardinals, pontiffs, “and those whose business it is to follow the Lamb wherever he may lead them.” In the second circle, the secular princes serve Christ in their own manner, with weapons and laws. “In a third circle let us place the common people all together, as the most lowly people in this world, but not so lowly that they are not members of Christ’s body just the same.”¹⁴ The image appears to be static except that each circle attracts to Christ the circle placed below it. A similar system appears in the *Divine Hierarchies* of Pseudo-Dionysius.¹⁵ This does not suggest conferring the gift of theology on the people. Their salvation depends on finding in their lives priests and bishops who will provide them with a proper explanation of the Gospel. The letter to Paul Volz is thus less innovative than the *Paraclesis*. It is noticeable also that not a single word is said in that letter concerning the place and function of the theologians. Are they included under the term “priests”? This is certainly possible, but if so, this would imply that it is not knowledge that gives a man authority, but the ministry and, what is more, the sacrament of ordination. Finally, one must consider where Erasmus places himself in this grand scheme. We may safely say that he situates himself within the first circle,

¹² LB V, 140E–F.

¹³ This appears in the preface to the second edition of *The Handbook of the Christian Soldier* (*Enchiridion militis christiani*), published in 1518. The text is translated by Charles Fantazzi and edited by John W. O’Malley in CWE 66, pp. 1–127.

¹⁴ Ibid., pp. 14–15.

¹⁵ See Gunther Heil, ed., *Hiérarchie céleste* (Paris, 1970). In Erasmus’ age, this text from the fourth or sixth century A.D. continued to exercise great influence. But Erasmus, unlike his contemporaries, did not believe that this text was the work of St. Paul’s disciple.

that of the clerical estate, since he was ordained a priest in 1492,¹⁶ and as a theologian (even if he denies that he is a theologian) he was well aware that one is a priest for eternity. After all, his first will and testament begins with the words: "I, Erasmus of Rotterdam, doctor of theology and priest of the diocese of Utrecht."¹⁷

We may now return to the question we asked earlier. The views communicated by Erasmus, more often than not, express a sacerdotal position. It is from that position that he assumes the greater part of his authority, reinforced, no doubt, by the authority granted him by his great scholarly knowledge. He is included in the first circle and need not envy the bishops and cardinals. Yet his belonging to the first circle earns him more responsibilities than privileges, for he must communicate to those farther away from Christ the light and the fire emanating from him.

II

Erasmus' correspondence with Guillaume Budé, edited and translated with great care by Marie-Madeleine de la Garanderie,¹⁸ allows us to go a little further and see how Erasmus assumes *de facto* the role of the modern intellectual. The psychological complexities of a difficult relationship, where friendship, admiration, and jealousy are intertwined, do not take away from the important questions posed by the two men. Budé repeatedly ranks Erasmus among the theologians. It is hard to tell whether Budé is baiting Erasmus or paying tribute to him. A theologian, according to Budé, should not depart from a certain stylistic gravity, from a certain loftiness, from a certain abstruseness. The mysteries of Scripture should not be revealed except to a learned elite. He cites the Proverbs of Solomon: "It is the glory of God to conceal things" (25:2).¹⁹ In a response contemporary with the *Paraclesis*, Erasmus explains the difference in their approach: "You have preferred to be understood by scholars... I... by the great majority. Your intention is to win your point;

¹⁶ See Halkin, *Érasme parmi nous*, p. 27.

¹⁷ *Érasme*, ed. Claude Blum, (Paris, 1992), p. 1129.

¹⁸ *La Correspondance d'Érasme et de Guillaume Budé* (Paris, 1967).

¹⁹ Ep. 493, in CWE 4, p. 41. Modern translations, more faithful to the Hebrew, render this verse: "It is God's privilege to conceal things and the king's privilege to discover them."

mine either to instruct or persuade.”²⁰ All the rest, including stylistic questions, flow from this source. It is almost scandalous: here is a cleric who writes to be understood and who, in addition, believes that the greatness of God will not be affected by this intention. Without taking a progressive view of history, which has its well-known drawbacks, one cannot help but notice that Erasmus is facing towards the future, and Budé towards the past. Erasmus has not taken the bait. He accepts the title of theologian, on the condition that he should remain at liberty to retain the language of which he is so fond, a language designed to reach a wider readership. Here we have the attitude of an intellectual, in the modern sense of the term.

At the same time, Erasmus challenges a recommendation made by Budé. Saddened by the quarrel between Lefèvre d'Étaples and Erasmus,²¹ Budé urged the latter to abandon the polemic, as was appropriate to a man of his fame, “whose name is now heard in every province of the West; to the dignity of the priesthood and... to your professional ethic as a theologian.”²² For Budé, such a polemic was beneath the theologian. Erasmus, however, was of a different opinion. Whatever the cost, and indeed sometimes with obvious glee, he debated and polemicized, for discussion was inseparable from persuasion. This is why Erasmus's status cannot be reduced to either that of a theologian, as Budé conceived of him, or to that of a philologist, as he is sometimes classified today. In this respect, again, he prefigures the modern intellectual.

It is highly possible, finally, that Erasmus's refusal to teach at the College of Royal Lecturers (later Collège de France), which King Francis I was in the process of founding in Paris, can also be explained by his calling. Budé, on behalf of the king, endeavoured to entice him with the image of an illustrious company where the great *literati* would meet, the eminent *eruditi* of all Europe. *Doctrina* (science), a sacred word for Budé, would reign unbounded there, at least for as long as the Sorbonne would tolerate it. We know that Erasmus never accepted the offer made by the king of France—no doubt to remain free, but also in order to act more effectively. He is acquainted with the great writers of the period and corresponds with them often. It is to them and not to the

²⁰ Ep. 531, 15 February 1517, in CWE 4, p. 238.

²¹ For a discussion on this quarrel, which is centred on an exegetical point (how to interpret Heb. 2:7) and which began in 1517, see below pp. 126–28.

²² Ep. 810, 12 April 1518, in CWE 5, p. 377.

king that he owes the greater part of his prestige. In their circle, he is an illustrious man. And it is as a “famous man” that he intervened in the “Reuchlin affair.”

III

Much has been written on the subject of the Reuchlin Affair,²³ and we know that Erasmus was sympathetic to the great German Hebraist. Nevertheless, many specialists have pointed out, with good reason, that the support Erasmus afforded him was inconstant, and, moreover, that he was embarrassed by Reuchlin’s conception of Judaism.²⁴ Reuchlin’s original adversary was a converted Jew in Cologne, Johann Pfefferkorn. As Erasmus saw it, Pfefferkorn’s goal was entirely transparent: to sow discord among the Christians. He therefore feared that Reuchlin, whose faith, in his view, had been vindicated, would become the instrument of a dark plot. The reasons that compelled so many contemporary humanists to defend Reuchlin must be reexamined here. What battle were they fighting? Under what banner was the battle carried on?

No doubt, they all regarded Reuchlin to be a great scholar. His knowledge of Hebrew, Cabala, and the Talmud made him one of the most eminent representatives of humanism in his time. It was in this spirit that Erasmus wrote to Pope Leo X and to Cardinals Riario and Grimani to defend Reuchlin. To begin with, he explained that Reuchlin, “equally at home in the three tongues, Greek, Latin, and Hebrew,” had aided him a great deal in his edition of the *New Testament*. He added: “It is quite right that the whole of Germany should admire and venerate this man as its true phoenix and especial glory.”²⁵ At this date, the case was in the hands of the pope.²⁶ Erasmus’ letter

²³ A good bibliography is found in A. Cisek’s article “Reuchlin,” in *Centuriae latinae: cent une figures humanistes de la Renaissance aux Lumières offertes à Jacques Chomarat* (Geneva, 1997), pp. 677–78. The classic account is in Ludwig Geiger, *Johannes Reuchlin, sein Leben und sein Werk* (Leipzig, 1871); see Max Brod, *Johannes Reuchlin und sein Kampf* (Stuttgart, 1965); Giulio Vallesse, *Erasmus e Reuchlin* (Naples, 1964); Manfred Krebs, “Reuchlin Beziehungen zu Erasmus von Rotterdam,” in Manfred Krebs, ed., *Johannes Reuchlin (1455–1522)* (1955, repr. Sigmaringen, 1994); E. Rummel, *The Case Against Johann Reuchlin: Religious and social Controversy in Sixteenth-Century Germany* (Toronto, 2002).

²⁴ See André Godin, “L’antijudaïsme d’Erasmus,” *Bibliothèque d’Humanisme et Renaissance* (1984), 537–53.

²⁵ Ep. 335, in CWE 3, p. 109.

²⁶ Let us summarize here the main events of a complicated trial and history. In the first decade of the sixteenth century, Johann Pfefferkorn, a converted Jew, initiated a

thus carried great weight. To address Riario and Grimani was good policy. Erasmus pleaded his friend's cause with eloquence, explaining to the two men that Reuchlin was the victim of jealousy, and that all the "learned" Germans were distressed about the unjust case that had been brought against him. Benevolence towards Reuchlin would earn the pope the gratitude of all scholars. It was an argument to which the son of Lorenzo the Magnificent could not be insensitive. Many other letters by Erasmus express the same sentiments. Although he kept his distance from certain overzealous defenders of Reuchlin, Erasmus continued to affirm that Reuchlin had been unjustly attacked and that all learned and honest men should support him.²⁷ "That scholars are supporting Reuchlin is a sign of enlightenment," he wrote.²⁸ Erasmus also emphasized the fact that apart from other troubles caused by the trial, it prevented Reuchlin from doing scholarly work. He could no longer devote himself in peace to the work of the Muses.²⁹

There were, however, limits to Erasmus' support for Reuchlin, as can be seen in a letter to Hermann von Neuenahr. Learned men, that is to say, intellectuals, should not get entangled with monsters such as Pfefferkorn,³⁰ Erasmus said. Reuchlin's polemic gave publicity to a sinister individual who was only too eager to be placed in the spotlight by some rather naive humanists. The *eruditi* should have enough sense

violent campaign against Judaism and advocated the destruction of Hebrew books. In 1510 Emperor Maximilian appointed a commission of experts, including Reuchlin, to examine Pfefferkorn's proposals. The proposal was endorsed by the commission with Reuchlin being the only dissenting member. A polemic ensued between Reuchlin, Pfefferkorn and his Dominican supporters at the University of Cologne. In 1511 Pfefferkorn published the *Handspiegel*; Reuchlin responded with the *Augenspiegel* (1511), followed by the *Defense against the Cologne Slanderers* (1512). Inquisitorial proceedings commenced, led by the inquisitor Jacob Hoogstraten, a professor in the faculty of theology at Cologne. In 1513 Reuchlin appealed to the pope. In the following year, he was acquitted by the ecclesiastic tribunal of the bishop of Speyer. Hoogstraten launched a counter-appeal in Rome, while Reuchlin gathered letters written by humanist scholars in his defense in *Clarorum virorum Epistolae* (March 1514). In October 1515 Crotus Rubianus and Ulrich von Hutten, both partisans of Reuchlin, published the first volume of the *Epistolae obscurorum virorum*, a collection of fictitious letters that ridicule the humanist's adversaries. A second volume followed in 1517. In the end, Reuchlin was condemned and fined by the papal court in 1520, but the judgement had no grave consequences. Reuchlin's university stood by him. Reuchlin died in 1522. For Jacques Lefèvre's involvement in the Reuchlin Affair see below, pp. 123–25.

²⁷ Ep. 703, addressed to Hermann von Neuenahr, one of Reuchlin's strongest supporters, in CWE 5, pp. 183–84.

²⁸ Ep. 701, in CWE 5, p. 181.

²⁹ See, for example, Ep. 333, in CWE 3, p. 91.

³⁰ Ep. 703, in CWE 5, pp. 183–84.

to keep their distance from ignoble individuals. The Nürnberg humanist Willibald Pirckheimer was of the same opinion. He reminded Reuchlin, in a letter of December 1512, that, in antiquity, the Ephesians had forbidden any utterance of the name of the arsonist who destroyed Diana's temple, lest glory be the reward for his crime. Reuchlin should follow this example, for his books only served to make his opponent, an obscure man, prominent.³¹ This logic explains the reservations of certain humanists who defended Reuchlin only discreetly.

Reuchlin had some hesitations and was unsure what attitude he should adopt toward his adversaries. Formidable in satire, as can be seen from his *Augenspiegel*, he sometimes seemed to opt for non-resistance. Pirckheimer supported this view, advising Reuchlin to ignore the attacks of a Thersites or a Zoilus—names paradigmatic of worthless opponents; he must remember that the wise man is always exposed to envy.³² Even more interesting is an exchange of letters between Cuspinian and Reuchlin, dating from spring 1512. The former urged his friend to scorn the folly of his adversaries.³³ The latter agreed wholeheartedly and responded that, indeed, nothing could affect a good man, in his lifetime or after his death: "Socrates is alive for eternity, he triumphs in glory, while the memory of his adversaries is altogether extinguished."³⁴ The allusion to Socrates serves to present Reuchlin as a martyr of truth, one of the just men who pay for their zeal with death. Blessed are they that suffer persecution for the sake of justice, he writes: "Ego vero beatus futurus sum quem persecuti sunt propter justitiam." Indeed, some of Reuchlin's correspondents consoled him: truth will triumph on its own.

Yet truth does not disdain assistance. A veritable "Reuchlinist party" emerged, which comprised the intellectual elite of the time. Erasmus himself did not wish to be included: "I am no Reuchlinist: I belong to no man's party, and detest these factitious labels."³⁵ He was reacting to the fact that the "Reuchlinists" had supported their hero in a boisterous fashion. They celebrated a triumph when he was acquitted in the

³¹ Ep. 234, in Arnold Reimann and Emile Reicke, eds., *Willibald Pirckheimers Briefwechsel*, 2 (Munich, 1940–97), p. 211.

³² Ep. 197, in *ibid.*, 2, p. 112.

³³ Ep. 147, in Johannes Reuchlin, *Briefwechsel*, ed. Ludwig Geiger (1875; repr. Hildesheim, 1962), p. 169.

³⁴ Ep. 148, in *ibid.*, p. 172.

³⁵ Ep. 1041, in *CWE* 7, p. 129.

first instance by the ecclesiastical tribunal of Speyer.³⁶ A contemporary engraving even represents Reuchlin entering his native city of Pforzheim “upon a Roman chariot of triumph, crowned with laurel and ivy, surrounded by friends, musicians and choristers: in his right hand, he holds the *Augenspiegel*, and in the left, the branch of a laurel tree. Allegories of Superstition, Envy, Barbary and Ignorance, as well as the figures of Hoogstraten [the inquisitor, who was also the prosecutor in the case], Pfefferkorn and Ortwin Gratius, follow the chariot on foot and in chains.”³⁷

More significant still for our study is the first collection of the *Clarorum virorum Epistolae*, published in Tübingen in 1514.³⁸ It consisted of a selection of letters addressed to Reuchlin by famous men of the Republic of Letters. As Geiger makes clear,³⁹ this was not an initiative taken by Reuchlin’s friends, but his own idea. In the words of the printer: “Johann Reuchlin has brought us this elegant volume in which a number of letters from very famous men are collected,” letters favourable to him and supporting his cause.⁴⁰ This could well be the first letter writing campaign in the history of ideas in the West. A writer, harassed by tribunals and attacked by redoubtable adversaries, uses public opinion and demonstrates the esteem in which he is held by “intellectuals” by publishing the letters they have addressed to him. The volume, prefaced by Philip Melanchthon, is impressive. It would have been even more so if it contained one or more letters from Erasmus. But the epistolary exchange between the two men did not begin until after this publication, and on Reuchlin’s initiative, who wrote to Erasmus for the first time in April 1514.⁴¹ A second volume of the *Letters of Famous Men* (*Illustrum virorum Epistolae*) was published in Haguenau in May 1519 by the printer Anshelm. Four letters by Erasmus were included: numbers 300, 324, 457, and 471. This second volume is even more interesting than the first, for in it is represented what one could truly call a “party of knowledge.” A contemporary list of Reuchlin’s defenders includes

³⁶ See Geiger, *Johannes Reuchlin*, pp. 290 ff., and Krebs, “Reuchlins Beziehungen,” p. 143.

³⁷ Cisek, “Reuchlin,” p. 669.

³⁸ Geiger, *Johannes Reuchlin*, pp. 322–23.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 323.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 322–23, note 5.

⁴¹ Ep. 290, in Allen 1, pp. 555–56; see Krebs, “Reuchlins Beziehungen,” p. 142 and notes 12 and 13.

more than twenty names, “the most scholarly and illustrious men in all of Germany” (*virī Germaniae totius literatissimi splendidissimique*).⁴² The first name on the list is Erasmus, “the most learned man of our age” (*vir seculi nostri doctissimus*). The names of Hutten, Capito, Oecolampadius, Peutinger, Mutianus Rufus, Pirckheimer, Vadianus, Lazius, Cuspinian, Melanchthon, and many others follow.⁴³ Other lists of Reuchlin supporters were circulated. Pirckheimer composed his own in an edition of Lucian, also including the name of Erasmus. The prominence given to his name did not suit the scholar from Rotterdam, who had no qualms about letting Reuchlin know of his displeasure.⁴⁴

German humanists were not the only ones to support Reuchlin. The *Farrago nova epistolarum*, a collection of letter to and from Erasmus published in 1519, contains an anonymous *post scriptum* to Letter 471, which supplies a list of “the very learned friends of Reuchlin in England.” There one finds the names of John Colet and Thomas More. Reuchlin was fortunate to have such supporters. Michelet was right: the sixteenth century was marked by the march of science against ignorance, and Reuchlin, surrounded by his friends, was emblematic of the era.

IV

There are other aspects, however, that emerge from the Reuchlin Affair and that deserve a closer examination. When Erasmus graciously spoke up in favour of Reuchlin, he took care to point out that the scholar did not stand alone and that he could count on broad support, beyond that of intellectuals. “He is . . . in high favour with the Emperor Maximilian,” he wrote to Riario, “of whose council he is a member.”⁴⁵ Erasmus wanted to make it clear to the cardinal that Reuchlin was an opponent to be reckoned with. The list of Reuchlin’s partisans was impressive. Among the names of famous writers were included the names of powerful and respected individuals. Immediately following the name of Erasmus appeared that of “Hermann Count of Neuenahr, exemplary

⁴² A facsimile of this list appears in Krebs, “Reuchlins Beziehungen,” p. 148.

⁴³ For a discussion of the lesser-known persons in this list, see the respective entries in CEBR.

⁴⁴ See Erasmus’ Erasmus’s Ep. 694, in CWE 5, pp. 164–71. Pirckheimer’s list appears in a long letter dated 30 August 1517, Ep. 464, in Reimann and Reicke, eds., *Willibald Pirckheimers Briefwechsel*, 3, p. 162.

⁴⁵ Ep. 333, in CWE 3, p. 91.

among all nobility" (*Hermannus comes de Neuenar, nobilium omnium specimen*). Maximilian's advisors were also included. Though his romantic image may suffer, it is clear that Reuchlin was no lone hero, standing one against all. He had friends in high places in the fight against the monster Ignorance. Moreover, the writers urged these individuals to intervene in support of one of the glories of Germany and to end the attacks of the Dominican inquisitor and his Dominican supporters in Cologne. On many occasions, Erasmus expressed impatience with the passivity of civil authorities. Why were the magistrates standing by and doing nothing? "They let this poisonous fellow [Pfefferkorn] rage with impunity against men of learning and substance (*in eruditos et claros homines*)."⁴⁶ It was up to a Hercules to hurl the monster down into infernal darkness, "for this is the way to deal with this species of monster, and not by writing pamphlets."⁴⁶ One could not make a clearer appeal to the secular arm to avenge Reuchlin.

Reuchlin's attitude justified the position taken by his partisans. He not only claimed to be a martyr for the truth; he also appealed to authority. The letter he addressed to the Medici pope Leo X in March 1517 is significant. It begins with a lengthy praise of the Medicis and, in particular, of Cosimo the Elder, under whom Florence achieved brilliance. Reuchlin enumerates the glories of his reign. Among learned men in Florence he lists Pico della Mirandola, Ficino, and Poliziano. He then proceeds to summarize the main points in his conflict with the Cologne Dominicans. To create this context is a clever strategy. Most surprising, however, is the way in which Reuchlin attempts to rally the pope: he has on his side, he explains, many Germans of high repute; his innocence, his good faith, his piety are guaranteed by princes, magistrates, and bishops. Thus he names as his most eminent supporters, not scholars, but those who possessed temporal authority.⁴⁷ We see where this argument is leading: the pope, assured by these witnesses to Reuchlin's innocence, must protect the humanist as his ancestors protected the Florentine writers of their time. This rhetorical strategy had already been employed by Reuchlin earlier in a letter to Mutianus Rufus. There the German humanist explained that the truth

⁴⁶ Ep. 703, in CWE 5, pp. 183–84.

⁴⁷ Ep. 238, March 1517, in Reuchlin, *Briefwechsel*, pp. 273–74.

was not his only defense. He was also championed by powerful figures who despised slander.⁴⁸

Finally, for an even better understanding of the Reuchlin affair, we must consider a particularly striking passage from a letter by Pirckheimer addressed to Neuenahr.⁴⁹ It recalls a dramatic episode in Florentine history: the case of Savonarola,⁵⁰ to which Erasmus also alludes.⁵¹ A hasty, romantic reading would see persecution as the element linking the two men. This would be a mistake, however. Savonarola is not the prototype of Reuchlin, but of the inquisitor Jacob Hoogstraten (Hochstraten). Both are Dominicans. Both equally believe it to be their duty to defend the cause of truth at all times. It seems the inquisitor often had a verse from Isaiah (62:1) on his lips: for Zion's sake, he would not keep quiet, even if it meant disobeying the emperor who had ordered the two parties to be silent and await the pope's decision. In both cases, there is disobedience: the inquisitor disobeyed the emperor as Savonarola had disobeyed the pope. Finally, action from the secular arm had been solicited against Savonarola.

One may observe here the strategy of the humanists. They do not rely on the powers of truth alone. They applaud truth, but it is a truth backed by men of consideration, a truth whose protagonists are allied with the powerful of this world. The *docti* in Reuchlin's party may have furnished the material for the first letter writing campaign in the history of the West, but for Erasmus, Reuchlin, and their humanist friends, knowledge was ultimately allied with power.

V

Already rather irritated by the turn taken by the Reuchlin affair, Erasmus became all the more incensed when the *Epistolae obscurorum virorum* (*Letters of Obscure Men*) were published. A first volume appeared in October 1515. A second was printed in 1517, while a few enlarged editions were also

⁴⁸ "Non sola veritate [...], verum etiam a potentissimis hominibus, qui et veritatem amant, et oderunt calumnias" (Ep. 168, in *ibid.*, p. 192).

⁴⁹ Ep. 540, in Reimann and Reicke, eds., *Willibald Pirckheimers Briefwechsel*, 3, p. 332.

⁵⁰ It would be very interesting to study the image of Savonarola in early humanism. To our knowledge, this study, which would no doubt yield many interesting surprises, has not yet been completed.

⁵¹ Ep. 694, in *CWE* 5, pp. 164–71.

made of the first.⁵² The humanist's displeasure is expressed in numerous letters, but the reasons put forward there are not the only ones, nor even the most important. On more than one occasion (letters 622 and 626), he deplores the personal attacks used by Hutten and his associates. This charge is indisputable. The authors lambaste Hoogstraten, Pfefferkorn, and the entire population of "obscure men," individually, in fictitious letters but under their real names.⁵³ All of these letters were addressed to one of the principal representatives of the anti-Reuchlinist party, "Our master" Ortvinus Gratius, who taught at the University of Cologne. The portrait of these "obscure men" is not flattering, to say the least. Each one is portrayed as more ignorant than the last. Drinking and fornicating shamelessly, they anticipate, in an even darker shade, the character of Janotus de Bragmardo. The satirical technique used in these letters was Rabelaisian before the term existed: the anonymous authors consistently heaped ridicule on themselves. The letters are written in a lively, macaronic Latin, beaming with the spirit of carnival and of student farces.⁵⁴ Even if Erasmus did not state it outright, it is clear that he appreciated neither the tone nor the style of the satire. His own *Praise of Folly* was very different, he thought.⁵⁵ His disapproval was all the more vivid as a result of his being suspected of having a hand in the work, as well as for being cited rather frequently in the second volume, published in 1517. Nothing displeases the humanist more than losing control over his image in print.

A less distinguished author would have been pleased by the praises that were addressed to him. He appears as a new Pico della Mirandola: "*homo valde doctus in omni scibili omnique doctrinarum genere*;"⁵⁶ "*a multis honoratur*."⁵⁷ He is praised for writing to the pope in support of Reuchlin; the "obscure men" fear his knowledge and influence. Yet, on at least two occasions, Erasmus is presented as more of a poet than a theologian. Worse yet: it is suggested that he has usurped his title of theologian: "*Super hoc est hic unus theologus, ut ipse se nominat, sed mihi videtur*,

⁵² See Aloys Bömer's introduction in his edition of the *Epistolae obscurorum virorum* (Heidelberg, 1924).

⁵³ Ibid., pp. 6–48.

⁵⁴ Ibid., pp. 65–74.

⁵⁵ Erasmus, Ep. 636 (CWE 5, p. 84), Ep. 808 (CWE 5, p. 359).

⁵⁶ Bömer, *Epistolae obscurorum virorum*, 1, p. 72. The author of this fictitious letter situates his meeting with Erasmus at the time of his triumphal journey to Strasbourg in 1514. See Halkin, *Érasme parmi nous*, p. 142.

⁵⁷ Bömer, *Epistolae obscurorum virorum*, 2, p. 38, p. 155.

quod est magis poeta."⁵⁸ It is well understood that an "obscure man" is speaking here. Still, this represented a double blunder for Hutten and his friends to raise the question of Erasmus' qualifications. They had made the mistake of propagating doubt concerning the veracity of Erasmus' title of theologian and the academic degree he acquired in Turin. In addition, they appear to have been unaware that the illustrious humanist avoided references to this degree. The intention of these authors is clear: to discredit scholastic theology which swore by nothing but Aristotle and his commentators and by the *disputatio* in due form. Neither Erasmus nor Reuchlin was devoted to this type of exercise "*sicut est mos*," in the scholastic tradition.⁵⁹ A character encountered by the author in another letter defends the scholastic concept of theology and qualifies as "sophistic" the theology of the men of Cologne.⁶⁰ Even so, the authors of the *Epistolae obscurorum virorum* were imprudent.

By implication, they also support the idea that anyone can practice theology. Everyone writes books that infringe upon the jurisdiction of the theologians: "omnes iam scribunt libros in theologia secundum suum libitum," one of the "obscure men" complains.⁶¹ He defends the idea that theology demands certain competencies and that one must know his place and recognize his limitations, asserting in rather ludicrous style: "Unusquisque debet manere in facultate sua, et non debet mittere falcem in messem alterius; quia sutor est sutor, et sartor est sartor, et faber est faber. Et non staret bene, si unus sartor vellet facere calceos." (Everyone should stay within the limits of his discipline and must not put his sickle into another man's harvest, for a cobbler is a cobbler, and a tailor a tailor, and a smith a smith. And it would not do, if a tailor wanted to make shoes.)⁶² Basing their arguments on old popular wisdom, the "obscure men" devised by Hutten and his friends raised legitimate questions more often than was desirable. The dissatisfaction felt by Erasmus must have been all the greater, since he had supported the idea that anyone could be a "theologian," if he read the Holy Scripture with piety. The trap was closing on him, by the fault of clumsy friends. What they desired and stated more or less openly, would soon be fulfilled a few years later when, in Germany, a

⁵⁸ Ibid. (in letter # 49; cf. letter # 38).

⁵⁹ Ibid., 2, p. 33, p. 148.

⁶⁰ Ibid., 2, p. 50, p. 174.

⁶¹ Ibid., 1, p. 48, p. 85.

⁶² Ibid., 1, p. 15, p. 30.

mixed crowd of authors (and not only theologians) wrote either for or against Luther. In some ways, the “Reuchlin affair” merely prefigures the Lutheran Reformation.

VI

The Reuchlin affair is enlightening in many respects. From it, we learn that one should not take the humanist campaign at face value. The authors of the *Letters of Obscure Men* defended their German colleague, but without really considering the question at the heart of the matter: that of Hebraic culture and the books that perpetuated it. For Erasmus and many others, the name Reuchlin became a standard that they brandished in their battle against medieval anachronism. Scholasticism was an infamy that had to be “quelled” at all costs. Other aspects of the Reuchlin Affair were secondary for many of them. The Cologne Dominicans and their mouthpiece, Pfefferkorn, made the mistake of attacking knowledge in the person of Reuchlin: a crime of *lèse majesté* that the *docti* could not tolerate. They struck back, drafting the prototypes of today’s petitions and mingling the greatest names in learned Europe with those of princes and of the powerful figures of the world. For them, knowledge required power to prevail. The time when the Spirit could speak alone had not yet come.

In a way, however, it was already in the offing. One could sense in Erasmus a foretaste of the Reformation and its prophetism. Indeed, the prophets did not care about learning. They spoke in the name of the Truth, and clung to it. Erasmus’ letter to Paul Volz adopts this position. But it does not have long-lasting effects on his engagements. It was not as a prophet or a priest that Erasmus took a stand in the Reuchlin affair, but as an eminent representative of the New Learning. As such, he did not hold the prophets of his time in high regard (to say the least), Savonarola being a fine example of his disdain. The only humanist of his time to have achieved a prophetic role was Thomas More, and a dire fate awaited him. His tragic destiny did not prevent intellectuals from holding to their belief in a blissful alliance of knowledge and power. It would take more than two centuries for this illusion to fade.

THE REACTION AGAINST BIBLICAL
HUMANISM IN SPAIN

ANTONIO NEBRIJA'S BIBLICAL SCHOLARSHIP

Carlos del Valle Rodríguez
(trans. Alejandro Coroleu)

The eminent Spanish grammarian Antonio de Nebrija (1441/44–1522) began his studies at Salamanca, a citadel of medieval scholasticism, but continued them at Bologna, where he was exposed to the ideas of Italian humanists. On his return to Spain, at the age of almost thirty, he entered the household of Cardinal Alfonso de Fonseca, archbishop of Seville, as tutor of his nephew Juan de Fonseca. By that time he had already conceived the enterprise to which he would devote the remainder of his life, an enterprise which was inspirational and bound to exert a decisive influence, introducing the spirit of the Renaissance to Spain. During his stay in Seville in the service of the archbishop (1470–1473), Nebrija realized that it was his mission to restore to Spain the classical Latin authors who had been exiled for so long.¹ He described the state of affairs he encountered in his homeland, the widespread ignorance of Classical Latin and letters, as barbarism (*barbaria* or *barbarie*).

After Fonseca's death, Nebrija found a new patron in Juan de Zúñiga, master of the military order of Alcántara and later archbishop of Seville. In the prologue to his Spanish-Latin dictionary of 1492, dedicated to this patron, Nebrija declared that he had chosen "a path which I alone was shown by God, namely to come to the fountain from which I first and, subsequently, all Spaniards could quench our thirst."² He soon came to realize, however, that his ideals and aims would be met with fierce opposition, that "a great confrontation was looming between him and all the barbarians" ("con todos los bárbaros se me aparejava alguna grande contención").

In 1505, after the deaths of Zúñiga and of Isabella of Castile, who had also supported his efforts, Nebrija accepted the offer of a chair at

¹ Antonio de Nebrija, Prologue to *El diccionario latino-español* (Salamanca, 1492); Felix G. Olmedo, *Nebrija (1441–1522): debelador de la barbarie, comentador eclesiástico, pedagogo, poeta* (Madrid, 1942), p. 13: "después de luengo tiempo restituisse en la posesion de su tierra perdida los autores del latín, que estaban ia muchos siglos avía, desterrados de España."

² Olmedo, *Nebrija (1441–1522)*, p. 13.

the University of Salamanca, which he had earlier refused. He vowed, however, “never to stop thinking of ways of destroying barbarism, which was present far and wide across the land.”³ Comparing his efforts with those of St. Peter and St. Paul, who began teaching the Gospel in Athens and Rome, the political and cultural capitals of their time, Nebrija began his frontal attack on the University of Salamanca, regarded as the bulwark of barbarism. “Once the fortress of the University had been taken,” he wrote, there was no doubt that “all the other towns in Spain would surrender in the end.”⁴

In Peter Martyr d’Anghiera’s poem celebrating Nebrija’s success, barbarism is depicted as an obese, filthy, stammering woman. In his reply, Nebrija recalled his decision, shortly after his return from Italy, “to declare war on the barbarians.” “In our first encounter,” he said, “I defeated *Barbaria* and succeeded in expelling her from our land. She was well entrenched in Spain and had illustrious captains in her army. In order to prevent liberation from her tyranny, Spaniards had built large fortresses. *Barbaria* held court at Salamanca. From there she dispatched men who terrified the country, held or killed the growers of letters, and sowed her own seeds instead. Eager to destroy such a plague, I was, however, warned by Minerva, who tends to favour ingenuity, and told that this was not the way of waging war. Attack, she said, *Barbaria* herself, who is the cause of so many calamities and holds court at Salamanca. Like Hercules, who, in his fight against the Lernaean Hydra, saw how every head of the Hydra he cut off immediately grew back again, and therefore was not able to kill the monster until he held its neck and strangled it, so you in your fight against this new monster must not aim at the heads but at the neck. In this manner

³ Ibid., 13.

⁴ Ibid., 13. Images of struggle, fight, and war are drawn from Lorenzo Valla’s *magnum certamen* against the barbarians, as described by the Italian humanist in his *Elegantiae*, see Francisco Rico, *Nebrija frente a los bárbaros: el cánón de gramáticos nefastos en las polémicas del humanismo* (Salamanca, 1978), p. 40. Around 1490 Fernando Manzanares published his *Flores rhetorici*, in which he stated that teachers at Salamanca did not know Latin and were not at all ashamed of their shortcomings (“One may say that *Barbaria* lives in our bones and that we suck it together with the milk we drink,” quoted in Olmedo, *Nebrija (1441–1522)*, p. 16). Writing to Marineo, Arias Barbosa concluded: “Only two or three men are found in Salamanca who speak Latin and a few more who speak Spanish, but the greater part speak like barbarians,” L.M. Sículo, *Epistolarum familiarium libri* (Valladolid, 1514) Book X, Ep. 2; Olmedo, *Nebrija (1441–1522)*, p. 46. See the documentation provided by Rico, *Nebrija frente a los bárbaros*, pp. 30ff., on the standard of Latin taught in fifteenth-century Spain.

you will succeed in expelling the monster and driving her to the lands of the Sarmatians and remote Garamantes.”⁵

The tool, the “weapon,” with which Nebrija was determined to defeat *Barbaria* and expel her from Spain were his *Introductiones in latinam grammaticam* and his Dictionary. First published in 1481, the *Introductiones* were enlarged in subsequent editions or reprints, and became a fully-fledged handbook of Latin scholarship.⁶ Nebrija’s success and victory were acknowledged by his contemporaries. Peter Martyr’s Latin poem “On the war waged by Nebrija against *Barbaria*, who has prevailed in Spain for so long” has already been mentioned. He wrote it in 1489 while in Almería.⁷ Another reader of the *Introductiones* noted: “Nebrija is the best grammar teacher ever, and the man who expelled barbarism from Spain.”⁸ Formerly a bitter rival of Nebrija, Lucio Marineo Sículo was also compelled to acknowledge Nebrija’s achievements upon his opponent’s death in 1522: “Spain recently lost her greatest supporter in literary matters, Antonio de Nebrija. He was the first to bring the Muses from Italy to Spain. They expelled barbarism from his fatherland, and he illuminated all of Spain with his lessons on the Latin tongue.”⁹

⁵ Olmedo, *Nebrija (1441–1522)*, pp. 123–124. In the letter to Cardinal Mendoza on the occasion of the second edition of his *Introductiones* in 1482, Nebrija pointed out that the one thousand copies of the text which had been sold augured that “*Barbaria* would be completely defeated” (cf. Rico, 1978, 41). See Rico, *Nebrija frente a los bárbaros*, p. 102, for further testimonies by fifteenth- and sixteenth-century authors engaged in the fight against barbarism.

⁶ In his *Introductiones* (Salamanca, 1481), fol. i, Nebrija expressed his hope of “overcoming the enemies of the Latin tongue against whom I declared war with this edition.” In the prologue to his Spanish-Latin dictionary of 1492 (BNM I–1.778), dedicated to Zúñiga, Nebrija boasted that he was “the first one to have opened a Latin shop in Spain and dared to raise a banner advertising the new precepts.”

⁷ MS 8470, fol. 219a (BNM); Olmedo, *Nebrija (1441–1522)*, pp. 121–123; Juan Bautista Muñoz, *Elogio de Antonio de Lebrija, leído en junta publica de la Real Academia de la Historia, el día 11 de julio de 1796* (Madrid, 1796), p. 8.

⁸ MS 8470, fol. 72a (BNM).

⁹ Sículo, *De rebus Hispaniae memorabilibus* (Alcalá, 1530), Book XXV, tit. De viribus Hispaniae illustribus: “I am not allowed by the learned Antonio de Nebrija to omit him because he was one of the most renowned men to have cultivated the letters. He clamours, and rightly so, because of his erudition, wisdom and eloquence. He complains that after having listed many others, I have so far left him out—a man, who bestowed a singular benefit on his fatherland and all of Spain, being the first to clothe her in Roman garb, when before she was submerged in mean barbarism... He returned to Salamanca, where, explaining the poets and orators, he also wrote his grammar with which he illuminated not only all of Spain, but also other nations. He exercised the same patience and perseverance in teaching Latin to Spaniards as those who spread the name of Christ and gradually tamed and softened their wild hearts with the sweet

A similar tribute can be read in the preface to Juan del Encina's *Arte de poesía castellana*: "Nebrija banished from Spain the barbarisms which had grown in our Latin tongue."¹⁰ In a gloss on Juan de Mena's *Laberinto de Fortuna*, Hernán Núñez de Toledo, professor of Greek at Alcalá, described Nebrija as the man "who had resurrected among us the Latin tongue and humanistic letters, which had so long been exterminated from Spain."¹¹

With seemingly modest means, Nebrija facilitated access to the new humanistic culture. The window and door opened by Nebrija allowed a fresh breeze to pass into the rarefied air of the Iberian Peninsula, which had been vitiated by the methods of the scholastics.¹² With his two grammar texts Nebrija paved the way to modernity in Spain. The two works may be regarded as the first steps towards bringing the Renaissance to Spain.¹³

Latin tongue. For this reason all of Spain is indebted to him, no less than Italy is to Lorenzo Valla. For Valla rooted out barbarism in Italy, Nebrija in Spain."

¹⁰ MS 8470, fol. 218a (BNM).

¹¹ Juan de Mena, *Laberinto de Fortuna* (Sevilla, 1495), fol. 114v, Copia 143.

¹² Nebrija poked fun at the attempts by several scholastics to find out whether the "quiditates of a human being (of Scotus, for example), crossing the sides of a dot, could fill the belly of the chimaera" (Olmedo, *Nebrija (1441–1522)*, p. 135).

¹³ F. Rico, "Lección y herencia de Elio Antonio de Nebrija 1481–1981," in V. García de la Concha, ed., *Nebrija y la introducción del renacimiento en España* (Salamanca, 1996) 13. Nebrija was convinced that, with his work, he had banished the old Latin schooltexts, which he deemed guilty of deteriorating the state of the Latin tongue: "E que ia casi del todo punto desarraigué de toda España los Doctrinales, los Pedros Elías e otros nombres aún más duros, los Galteros, los Ebrardos, Pastranas e otros no sé qué apostizos e contrahechos grammáticos no merecedores de ser nombrados" (Prologue to *Dictionarium latino-hispanicum*, Salamanca, 1492). As with Lorenzo Valla, Nebrija often lists the names of the so-called pernicious grammarians. *Doctrinale* designates the text by Alexander of Villedieu. "Galteros" designates Galteri de Castellione's *Alexandreis*, ed. M.L. Colker (Padua, 1978). "Ebrardos" refers to Eberhard of Bethune's *Graecismus*, written at the end of the thirteenth century, see J. Wrobel, ed., *Eberhardi Bethunensis Graecismus* (Breslau, 1887). "Pastranas" designates the work of Juan de Pastrana, cf. J.M. Casas Homs, "El *thesaurus pauperum* de Juan de Pastrana. Un manuscrito catalán," AST 22 (1949), 233–248. Elsewhere in his writings Nebrija includes Uguccone of Pisa, who flourished around 1200, among the pernicious grammarians mentioned above, cf. C. Riessner, *Die Magnae Derivationes des Uguccone da Pisa und ihre Bedeutung für die romanische Philologie* (Rome, 1967). He also includes Giovanni Balbi da Genova's *Catholicon* of 1286, as well as Marquesido de Regio Lérido's *Mammotrectus* (late twelfth century or early thirteenth century, and published in Mainz in 1470 and in Venice in 1478, 1479, and 1482). The importance of the *Doctrinale* is apparent from the fact that reading and knowledge of the text were required as part of the Paris curriculum: "Scolares antequam ad determinandum in artibus admittantur, congrue sint in grammatica edocti et Doctrinale et Graecismum audiverint, dummodo in studiis aut aliis locis ubi grammaticalia didicerint dicti libri legantur," H. Denifle and E. Chatelain, *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, 4 (Paris 1889–1897), p. 1459. As an example, three editions of

Nebrija's humanism is, however, a Christian humanism. For him, Latin did not only facilitate knowledge of classical writers but also of Christian classics writing in that language. As he stated in his *Introductiones latinas*, "for our full contentment and the satisfaction of our needs, we need no knowledge other than of the language on which are founded not only our religion and Christian republic, but also civil and canon law by which men living in this great assembly called the city are ruled... Those who devote themselves to the study of Holy Writ are unable to understand the books of the holy founders of our religion, a shortcoming that leads them to turn their attention to other authors, who write in the language these students of Holy Writ have learned."¹⁴

Accordingly, Nebrija produced editions of, and commentaries on, liturgical hymns (*Aurea Hymnorum expositio*, Alcalá 1526; Sedulius' *Carmen Paschale*, Salamanca 1510), as well as the epistles and Gospels with the corresponding homilies of the Church Fathers—all texts read in schools.¹⁵ Yet Nebrija's main contribution to this field lay in scriptural studies. Equipped with a knowledge of the three biblical languages, Nebrija was particularly well suited to the task, far better than many of his contemporaries, even those with sound theological grounding. In the preface to his *Introductiones* of 1492, dedicated to Queen Isabella, Nebrija announced his decision to abandon the study of grammar, once his historical investigations had been completed, in order to devote himself to biblical scholarship.¹⁶ Moreover, while at work on his *Apologia* in 1507, he informed his readers that he had devoted ten years of his life to the study of Scripture with two main objectives in mind: to refine textual passages which had been subject to corruption through scribal negligence and to elucidate the hidden meaning of certain words and terms.¹⁷

the text were issued in Barcelona as late as 1503 (Olmedo, *Nebrija (1441–1522)*, p. 8); in 1485 Andrés Gutiérrez de Cerezo published his *Brevis grammatica* (Burgos, 1485; BNM, I-164), in which he reworked the *Doctrinale*.

¹⁴ *Introductiones latinae* (Zamora, c. 1492), preface.

¹⁵ *Sequentia ex Epistolis Pauli, Petri, Iacobi et Ioannis necnon ex prophetis quae in re divina leguntur per anni circulum... Quibus Antonius Nebrissensis adiecit grammatica quaedam scholia non contemnenda* (Alcalá, 1525).

¹⁶ "Extremum laborem quia nobis in animo est posteaquam antiquitates hispanienses absolverimus, omne reliquum vitae nostrae tempus in sacris libris consumere," *Introductiones in latinam grammaticem* (Alcalá, 1523), fol. 4b.

¹⁷ "Omnes vigilae meae, Pater amplissime, quas ab hinc decenio sacris litteris impendi, eo spectare videntur ut aut quosdam locos librariorum negligentia vitiatos

Even though Nebrija published further texts on grammatical issues and continued to enlarge the contents of his *Introductiones*, the last two decades of his life were chiefly devoted to the study of Scripture. The year 1502 witnessed the publication of his *De dictionum peregrinarum et quarumdam aliarum accentu opus utilissimum*, which was followed by *De peregrinarum dictionum accentu* of 1506. In 1503 Nebrija published *De vi ac potestate*, on comparative phonetics of Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. In 1507 he read his *Repetitio IV de etymologia dictionis* in Salamanca. It included a discussion of the etymology of several biblical names, showing that they were derived not from Hebrew, but from Greek or Latin.¹⁸ In 1508 he published the *Apologia*, defending the use of the Hebrew and Greek texts, *Hebraica veritas* and *Graeca veritas*. In 1515 he published *De litteris hebraicis* and *De accentu hebraico*, and a year later the *Tertia quinquagena*, a miscellaneous collection of fifty annotations on passages from the Old and New Testament. At the end of the *Apologia*, a list of topics dealt with in the *Tertia quinquagena* is provided: 1) Abimelech pro Achimelech; 2) Antiochia ad Daphnen quae civitas; 3) Artemon in nave quid est; 4) Aurichalchum pro chalcolibano; 5) Azotus civitas pro Asdod; 6) Bethdagon cuius Dei domus; 7) Bersabee Urie uxor pro Bethsabe; 8) Bersabee puteus pro Beersabe; 9) Bethsaida pro Bethesda; 10) Cameloparladis quae quadrupes; 11) Castores sive discori qui sunt; 12) Charadrius quae avis est; 13) Cimiterium pro coemiterio; 14) Cyprus quae planta est; 15) Collirida pro collicida; 16) D. littera pro r e contra r pro d; 17) Delbora pro Debora; 18) Dextra et sinistra in numeris; 19) Dextra et sinistra in sedendo aut eundo; 20) Drama et dragma et drachma quid est; 21) Electrum in Iezechiele quid est; 22) Euroaquo pro euroclydo; 23) F litteram non debet poni prope h; 24) Gaius pro Caius hoc est g pro c; 25) nota aspirationis ubi non debet poni; 26) Jesus pro Iosue et Iehousa; 27) Joannes pro Iona; 28) Lustrum et olympias an idem sint; 29) M littera otiose adiecta; 30) Magi an tres et an reges; 31) Mitilene pro Melita insula; 32) Meditor pro exerceor; 33) Micol filia Saul pro Merob; 34) Mygale quod animal; 35) Moyses an Moses an utrumque; 36) Non particula adiecta aut detracta; 37) Onocrotalus que avis est; 38) Porphyrio que avis est; 39) Praetorium et praetoliolum quid est; 40) Scutulata vestis quae sit; 41) Symbolum

emacularem aut quorundam verborum reconditos sensus in lucem eruerem" (In the first, undated edition of the *Apologia*, fol. b ii recto).

¹⁸ R. Chabás ed., "Epístola del maestro de Lebríja al Cardenal..." *Revue de archives, bibliothèques y museos* 8 (1903), 493. The *Repetitio IV* is not extant.

quid est; 42) Simila et similago quid in tritico; 43) Sin coniuncta pro sed si; 44) Stibium in metallis quid est; 45) Striatum opus non histriatum; 46) Tabitha in Marco pro Talitha; 47) Tibiicines cur in puellae funere; 48) U consonans pro vocali et contra; 49) Zelotes an poni possit pro cananeo; 50) Zona pro marsupii quodam genere. Arrangement of items discussed was alphabetical. In the edition consulted by us (Alcalá, 1516; BNM, R-2212), only 49 items occur. Items 1, 2, 7, 8, 14, 16, 23, 25, 29, 30, and 39 from the list above are missing, and they are replaced by further items (Arceuthina, Cynus, Daphne, Git, herba fullonum, Maenianum, Phase, Phiton, Scruta, traducere).¹⁹

According to Muñoz, towards the end of his life Nebrija told his pupil Cosme Damián Zabалlos: "I have written over ten thousand annotations on the Old and New Testament, similar in style and taste to the fifty already enjoyed by readers, which rightly deserve the palm among scholars of Scripture. I have gathered approximately five thousand annotations, all on passages subject to corruption due to the ignorance of critics and copyists."²⁰ This information is confirmed by an anecdote told by Nebrija himself in his treatise against Reuchlin and Erasmus.²¹ In early 1522 two Salamanca professors, Francisco González and Juan Ortega, visited Alcalá to discuss the move of the Trilingual College of San Ildefonso to Salamanca and its merger with the University. While in Alcalá, they met with Nebrija, who was encouraged by Ortega to publish "those five thousand passages which you have found corrupted in the biblical text through errors introduced by copyists." Ortega further advised Nebrija to re-examine his conclusions regarding the words

¹⁹ In his treatise against Reuchlin and Erasmus, Nebrija emphasized the originality of the items discussed in his work *In Quinquaginta Sacrae Scripturae locos* (better known as *Tertia Quinquagena* and abbreviated in the following as *TQ*): "In qua locos quinquaginta in sacris litteris non ex vulgi opinione, sed nova quadam ratione et a me primum excogitata, declaravi," Carlos Gilly, *Spanien und der Basler Buchdruck bis 1600: ein Querschnitt durch die spanische Geistesgeschichte aus der Sicht einer europäischen Buchdruckerstadt* (Basel, 1985), p. 210. On the words *talitha* and *tabitha* in Mark and Luke respectively, he wrote: "Nam ego primus omnium nostri saeculi mortalium in Marco locum illam adnotavi quo tempore Reuchlinus et Erasmus nondum forsitan in lucem erant editi," *ibid.*, p. 200. It is worth pointing out that some of the items announced in the *Apologia* as subject of further discussion in the *Tertia Quinquagena*, do not occur there but in the *De litteris Hebraicis*. See, for example, item no. 16: *D. littera pro r e contra r pro d*.

²⁰ Muñoz, *Elogio*, p. 35.

²¹ *In Reuchlinum Phorcensem et Erasmus Roterodamum...*, ed. C. Gilly in *El Erasmismo en España* (Santander, 1986), pp. 195–203. For Reuchlin see Ménager's chapter above, pp. 39–54.

talitha and *tabitha* while informing him of Reuchlin's new reading: "abiti cumi" for "talita cumi."²²

In the prologue to his *Dictionary* (Burgos, 1512), addressed to Miguel Pérez de Almazán, Nebrija declared his intention to compile two Hebrew lexica: "one including all Hebrew words in the Bible, showing only the letters, how they should be accented, as well as their meaning, and a second one with all the rare or foreign words in the Bible, which are commonly thought to be Latin or Greek."²³ Moreover, in the letter to Cristóbal Escobar dated 26 June 1504, Nebrija referred to a dictionary of Hebrew proper names and place-names, in which many entries had been corrected from those wrongly supplied by copyists. Escobar was further informed by Nebrija of a textcritical method which he had pondered and which had been employed in the Septuagint and by other translators, a method that allowed conclusions about the correct reading.²⁴ In the *De vi ac potestate* (1503) he announced the forthcoming publication of a lexicon of Hebrew words.

Of the exegetical work projected in these remarks, only the *Tertia Quinquagena* has been preserved. Neither biblical vocabulary was ever published, unless we include among them the list of Hebrew names featured in the *Repetitio III* and, subsequently, in *De accentu hebraico*. Relatively recently, however, two biblical vocabularies of Hebrew proper names written by Nebrija were discovered by Pascual Galindo in the Vatican Library (cod. Vat. lat. Borg. 148). Published in 1950 by Galindo with the assistance of Luis Ortiz Muñoz, they include, respectively, 2,953 and 2,165 entries, but they do not match the plans outlined by Nebrija. It is, therefore, likely that they served as drafts. The latter dictionary seems to complement the former.²⁵

²² "Ut priusquam quinque mille locos illos, quos librariorum negligentia depravatos in sacris litteris deprehendisti, in lucem edas, illud quod iam pridem de talita publicasti maturius perspicias," (Gilly, *Spanien und der Basler Buchdruck*, p. 207.)

²³ Olmedo, *Nebrija (1441–1522)*, p. 113. Revilla believes this vocabulary to be a proper Hebrew dictionary (M. Revilla Rico, *La Poliglota de Alcalá. Estudio histórico-crítico*, Madrid, 1917, p. 15).

²⁴ "Unum opus est in sacris litteris continens rationem nominum hebraicorum sive illa sint propria virorum et feminarum, sive locorum, sylvam multis annis intactam, ubi deprehensi sunt innumeri errores incuria librariorum in recentiores codices transcripti, vulgoque recepti. Adiecimusque artificium quod septuaginta primum, deinde reliqui interpretes tam graeci quam latini secuti sunt, unde facile dignosci potest quae dictio recte, quae perperam scripta sit," Ms 8470, fol. 288b, BNM.

²⁵ As an example, see the term *Abdias* in the first lexicon: "Abdias, unus ex duodecim prophetis qui dicuntur minores. Per ain in principio, sequenti o, deinde per b subiecto a sequenti d cum seva, ut pertineat ad syllabam praecedentem. Nos primam syllabam

According to Nebrija's own statements in the *Apologia*, his activity as biblical scholar soon met with resistance, which forced him to proceed in a cautious manner and eventually reduced him to silence. Dedicated to Cardinal Jiménez de Cisneros, shortly after he was elected Spain's Inquisitor General on 17 May 1507, the *Apologia* was published around 1508. Nebrija was well aware that he could count on the Cardinal's support. Apart from providing us with important information on Nebrija's own scholarly activities, on his aims and objectives as biblical scholar, and on the obstacles to his work, the text constitutes a true landmark in the history of biblical scholarship in Spain, defending the use of the original Hebrew and Greek texts. Last but not least, it is an excellent example of the new attitude, on the part of humanists, to biblical exegesis.

Nebrija had by then already completed the *Quinquagena*, his series of annotations to, or short essays on, fifty disputed words in Holy Scripture. Each entry included an elucidation of the term or proof of alternative readings in the Bible. The text was confiscated (between 1500 and 1504) by Fray Diego Deza, then Bishop of Palencia and later Archbishop of Seville, as well as Inquisitor General from 1499 to 1507.²⁶ Although Nebrija compiled a second *Quinquagena* almost immediately, he maintained absolute secrecy about it until there was no more risk of confiscation. At that time, in 1516, he published a third version of the text (entitled *Tertia Quinquagena*, although it included only 49 entries rather than the 50 implied by the title).

In his *Apologia* Nebrija defended himself against those who accused him of impiety for touching Holy Writ. He also answered the accusation that he was not entitled to discuss biblical texts because he was a layman trained only in grammar and not a theologian. In his defence, Nebrija stood up to the oppressive authority of the Inquisition. More poignantly, he noted that the issues at stake were not theological matters concerning faith, which must be piously accepted by the intellect "in obedience to Christ," but obvious and clear truths outside the realm of faith, which one could not examine, however, for fear of being denounced or sent to prison: "Would it not be enough to restrain my intellect for the love of Christ in those things which religion instructs

expunsimus et secundae literae invertimus ut sit apud illos Obadia, apud nos Abdias. Vide Obdias" (P. Galindo and L. Ortiz-Muñoz, eds., *Nebrissensis biblica*, Madrid, 1950, *sub voce*).

²⁶ Ms 8470, fol. 149b, BNM.

me to believe? Must I also be compelled to claim ignorance in all other matters which I have explored, discovered, known and proven, things which are clearer than light, truer than truth itself? I know them not through dreams, opinions or conjectures, but through firm reasoning. They are irrefutable arguments and cogent demonstrations. What sort of slavery is this, what enormous power is this which does not allow you to express yourself freely without jeopardising your piety? Why do I say 'express'? You are not even allowed to write them down in secret in your own four walls or whisper them quietly in a cave, or ponder them by yourself!" (*Apologia*, A i).

Obedient to the Church in matters concerning faith, but intellectually free in all other spheres of activity, Nebrija's attitude was representative of the new humanistic culture. Moreover, he proved the legitimacy of his exegetical work as grammarian, that is, in the field of textual criticism and philology, and in explaining the terminology. He based his arguments for the legitimacy and the need within the Church for textual criticism on statements of several Church Fathers. According to Augustine, "the interpreter is greatly assisted by the collation of codices, provided that they contain no false readings. For the first duty of those who wish to correct Holy Scripture is to emend the manuscripts in a scrupulous manner, so that uncorrected manuscripts may yield to those which have been emended."²⁷

For Jerome, applying textual criticism to biblical texts was a legitimate activity. According to his criteria, when there were several variant readings in Latin codices of the New Testament, the critic should resort to the original Greek in order to solve any difficulties which may arise; likewise, when Latin codices provided variant readings that did not accord with the Greek codices, the Hebrew text should be consulted. In cases of doubt or conflict within the manuscript tradition, the critic should, therefore, always resort to the original text.²⁸

²⁷ Augustine, *De doctrina christiana* 2, 14.

²⁸ "...quoties in Testamento novo inter libros latinos fuerit reperta veritas, recurramus ad graecos; quoties inter latinos inter se aut inter latinos et graecos in testamento veteri fuerit aliqua differentia, certitudinem petamus ex veritate fontis hebraici. Itaque semper in dubiis ad linguam praecedentem eundem esse praecipimus" (*Apologia earum rerum quae illi obiiciuntur*, A iii recto). Unless otherwise specified, the quotations from the *Apologia*, which was composed c. 1507/8, are according to the text published in Granada, 1535. Yosef Qimhi (fl. in the thirteenth century) stressed the importance of the Hebrew text "which is the father, the master, and the original." This criterion was also defended by Jerome in several passages: "ut enim veterum librorum fides de hebraicis voluminibus examinanda est, ita novorum graeci sermonis normam desiderat" (Jerome,

Cardinal Cisneros himself, under whose guidance the Complutensian Polyglot was going forward, subscribed to these criteria. In the preface to Pope Leo X he pointed out that "wherever variant readings occur in the Latin codices or in those cases in which a passage is suspected of having been subject to corruption, an instance which is rather frequent due to scribal ignorance or negligence, we must resort to the original text, as strongly recommended by Jerome, Augustine and other Church Fathers. In so doing, the faithfulness of the books in the Old Testament may be examined *ex Hebraica veritate*, and that of the books in the New Testament, from the Greek codices."

Some of Nebrija's critics argued that the Latin codices were far more correct than the Greek and Hebrew ones. It was, therefore, not necessary to consult the latter, especially (they argued) since it was likely that Hebrew scholars had deliberately corrupted the codices in order to deny Christians the textual basis for their religious truths. Nebrija vehemently rejected such charges while stressing the diligence with which biblical codices had been transmitted by Hebrew scholars. They had painstakingly enumerated and counted not only the words included in the biblical text, but also syllables and letters, so that, to use Christ's words, not a single jot or tittle may be dropped from it."²⁹ Invoking Canon 11 of the Council of Vienne (1312), further confirmed by the Council of Basel of 1434, Nebrija believed that the papacy prescribed the study of Greek and Hebrew at the most important universities in Europe in order to uphold the standards of acceptable textual criticism.³⁰

Bearing in mind these comments, as well as the letter written to Cisneros, we conclude that Nebrija did not intend only to mark the correct spelling of certain words or the precise meaning of particular terms, or simply to decide which was the best variant found in the Latin codices of the Vulgate. Rather, he sought to correct the text of

Ep. 71); "lege graecos codices et latinos et confer cum his opusculis et ubicumque inter se videris discrepare, interroga quemlibet Hebraeorum cui magis accomodare debes fidem" (Prologue to the Book of Joshua, *Biblia sacra iuxta Vulgatam versionem*). On the same principle in Erasmus, see Marcel Bataillon, *L'Édition scolaire coimbroise des "Colloques" d'Erasmus* (n.p., 1950), p. 20.

²⁹ "non est credibile illos quicquam immutasse, cum sint alioqui in transcribendis, castigandis, recognoscendisque libris multo quam nos diligentiores, hebraei maxime qui omnia veteris instrumenti nonmodo verba, sed et syllabas et litteras ad certos numeros redegerunt, et, ut salvatoris nostri verbis utar, neque unum iota neque unus apex ab illis praetereatur" (*Apologia A iv verso- A v recto*).

³⁰ "Quorsum igitur pertinuit providentia illa pontificum qui scitis atque decretis suis sanxerunt litteras graecas et hebraicas in gymnasiis publicis legi?" (*Apologia, A v verso*).

the Vulgate itself on the basis of the Greek and Hebrew codices. He believed, however, that such corrections should not introduce radical readings by adding or subtracting letters or words or changing their order. He remarked on Reuchlin's daring innovation, replacing *talita cumi* with *abita cumi* (Mark 5:41): "Who gives Reuchlin permission to add, subtract, alter, or change letters, syllables, or terms as he pleases? And to make matters worse, he does so not to emend an erroneous reading, but to propose an erroneous one for an existing correct reading."³¹ Nebrija advocated the need, however, for a new translation where the old one departed from the original Greek or Hebrew.

Nebrija's defence of his right, as grammarian, to discuss the spelling of certain words, to prescribe rules concerning their accentuation, and to elucidate obscure and difficult meanings seems rather a circumstantial plea "to ride out a passing storm."³² A closer analysis of his letter to Cisneros shows that Nebrija was still hoping to revise the text of the Vulgate on the basis of texts in the original language. Nebrija's dangerous views on the matter—similar to those held by Lorenzo Valla and Erasmus—made him suspect in the eyes of the Inquisition.³³ Indeed, Fray Luis de León's (1527–91) assertion that a new translation of the Vulgate could in many passages improve Jerome's version led to his

³¹ "Quis illi permetteret ut pro commodo suo addat, detrahat, mutet et transmutet litteras vel syllabas vel dictiones? Cum praesertim id facit non ut ex depravata lectione veram restituat, sed ut ex vera mendosam faciat," (Gilly, *Spanien und der Basler Buchdruck*, p. 206). Later in the text he remarked: "Quis vobis permetteret aut daret facultatem addendi aut detrahendi quicquam ex eo quod scriptum est?" *ibid.*, p. 221. According to Nebrija, this system allows Holy Scripture to justify even the biggest heresies. Respect for the original text and reluctance to introduce any emendations were common practice among Hispanic exegetes of the Hebrew texts: "Si el intérprete, decía Menahem ben Saruq (Tortosino, siglo X), en cada palabra que no entiende y cuya inteligencia se le oculta, se pone a buscar su significación y a entender su sentido a base de quitar o sustituir letras o aumentar la raíz, resultaría del valle un llano, se harían fáciles los obstáculos y se abriría la puerta a toda iniciativa," Carlos del Valle Rodríguez, "La exégesis bíblica de Menahem ben Saruq," *Revista Catalana de Teologia* 2 (1977), 491.

³² In his letter to Cisneros, Nebrija remarked: "Yo degé allí publicado que venía a Alcalá para entender en la emendación del latín que está comúnmente corrompido en todas las Biblias Latinas cotejándolo con el Hebraico, Caldaico i Griego" (Chabás, *Epístola*, p. 3).

³³ M. Menéndez y Pelayo described Nebrija as the scholar who introduced Lorenzo Valla's rational and philosophical method in Spain (*Antología de poetas líricos castellanos*, Madrid, 1894, pp. 187ff.), a view shared by Américo Castro: "Es preciso ir más lejos y hacer en él al heredero de las audacias de Lorenzo Valla en materia de filología sagrada y quizá también de su actitud frente a las tradiciones de la Iglesia"; see Américo Castro, *Lengua, enseñanza y literatura* (Madrid, 1924), pp. 140ff.; quoted by Bataillon, *L'Édition scolaire coimbroise*, p. 25.

prosecution and incarceration at the hands of the Inquisitor between 1572 and 1576.³⁴

In his *Apologia*, Nebrija had already declared his intention to restore Jerome's edition to its original purity by expurgating any textual corruption introduced in the past due to negligence on the part of the copyists.³⁵ He would do so, he announced, by collating codices to show whether Jerome's edition coincided with, or departed from, the texts in the original languages. Cisneros would, however, permit only collation of same-language texts, refusing to emend the Vulgate translation on the basis of the Hebrew or Greek.³⁶

Nebrija's critics questioned his right to discuss any issues relating to biblical scholarship, since he was only a grammarian. They claimed that textual criticism was restricted to professors of theology, and only with the Pope's permission or the authority of a General Council. Nebrija accepted that, as a layman, he was not entitled to discuss any matters concerning articles of faith. Yet, as a grammarian, with a degree endorsed by the pope, it fell within his jurisdiction to pinpoint

³⁴ "In many instances, in the text of the Vulgate, in those passages concerning articles of faith, the sacraments of the Church or the conduct of the faithful, the text could be translated much better than it has been rendered by the Latin interpreter." Quoted by Pedro de Palencia, *Tratado cerca la Regla del Catálogo que disponen la lición de las glosas de Rabinos* (20 Diciembre 1611), MS 1076, fol. 24b, BNM. The charges against Fray Luis included his decision to translate the *Cantica Canticorum* into Spanish, his "Jewish sympathies," his preference for the original texts of Scripture over the Vulgate, as well as his defence of new and dangerous theories. See E.D. Carretero León, "León, Luis de," in Quintín Aldea Vaquero et al., eds., *Diccionario de Historia Eclesiástica de España* (Madrid, 1972), *ad loc.* Even though the Vulgate translation was at first innovative and was met with opposition from Christian groups who did not want it to replace the *Vetus Latina*, the Vulgate had come to dominate intellectual life within the Church. Any change to the traditional text was therefore seen as a threat. This may account for the belligerent positions of both theologians and the Inquisition towards any attempt to question the Vulgate. See N. Fernández Marcos and E. Fernández Tejero, "Biblisimo y Erasmismo en la España del siglo XVI," in M. Revuelta Sañudo and C. Morón Arroyo eds., *El Erasmismo en España* (Santander, 1986), 100ff.

³⁵ "Nunc autem de unicis tantum interpretis, hoc est, Hieronymi simplici interpretatione laboramus ut quod librorum negligentia depravatum erat, suo auctori acceptum referatur. Idque partim fecimus et partim facturi sumus conferendo recentiores codices cum vetustatis adorandae codicibus latinis qui facile ostendunt quid Hieronymus nobis scriptum reliquerit si modo consentit aut non discordat ab eo quod in hebraeis graecisque voluminibus habetur atque in eo laborare velim ab istis edoceri quod aereoseos genus sit. Nam neque aereiticum quid continent neque aeresin sapit" (*Apologia*, *Aviii verso*).

³⁶ "Entonces V. Sa. me dijo que hiciesse aquello mesmo que a los otros avia mandado, que no se hiciesse mudanza alguna de lo que comúnmente se halla en los libros antiguos" (Chabás, *Epístola*, 493).

errors in the biblical text and to propose emendations. The text of the Bible was, after all, subject to the rules established by the grammarian Donatus: "Will Antonio de Nebrija not be allowed to discuss points of orthography . . . or to propose rules on how to accentuate words to those who lack proper training in this subject? Or to elucidate the obscure and difficult meaning of certain words? Isn't this the bailiwick of the grammarian? They must not seek refuge in the authority of St. Gregory who said that the text of the Bible was not subject to Donatus' rules. For, even though grammar is an ancillary discipline, it is superior to all other disciplines when it deals with letters, syllables and words . . . I have been awarded the title of Master in the liberal arts through Apostolic authority. As Professor of Grammar at the University of Salamanca I am entitled to discuss, examine, and adjudicate all issues related to my profession. No one is allowed to restrict the terms of my jurisdiction. I should be permitted to pass along all arts and sciences, not as an interloper but as an explorer of the things, which these disciplines discuss. Should anything come under my judgment, I should be able to correct and emend it" (*Apologia*).³⁷

The importance of grammar as a seminal discipline is emphasized elsewhere by Nebrija as well. For example, in his *Introductiones* he stated: "It befits grammar to be present at all times and in all places, so that you may not do anything without it, whether you read, write, speak or think. Quintilian rightly said of grammar: it is necessary for children, pleasant for the elderly, sweet companion of those who are alone."³⁸

This idea was further defended by Nebrija in his *De vi ac potestate*. Against those who were dismissive of grammar he declared: "I could

³⁷ On whether Holy Scripture is subjected to grammatical rules, see Mates's assertion in his *Pro condendis orationibus iuxta grammaticam leges litteratissimi auctoris Bartholomei Mates Libellus* (Barcelona, ca. 1488), fol. c6: "Ad hoc respondet Hugutius, quod licet ars grammatical ita exigat, potest tamen aliter invenire in divina pagina quae non coartatur regulis grammaticorum"; quoted in Rico, *Nebrija frente a los bárbaros*, p. 65. Lorenzo Valla had dismissed all those who claimed that the Holy Writ and theology were not subjected to grammatical rules ("theologiam inservire praeceptis artis grammaticae," *Annotationes in Novum Testamentum*, in *Opera omnia*, repr. Turin, 1962, I, 808). The idea stemmed from a passage in Gregory's *Moralia* ("quia indignum vehementer existimo ut verba caelestis oraculis restringam sub regulis Donati," PL 75, 516). Peter Abelard, *Theologia christiana*, 3. 126, and 4. 77.

³⁸ "At vero grammaticae omni in loco omnique tempore ita praesto est, ut si quid legas, si quid scribas, si cum alio loquaris, si denique tecum ipse quid cogites, sine illa efficere nullo modo possis. Atque ut de illa fabius verissime scripsit: necessaria est pueris, iucunda senibus, dulces secretorum comes . . ." *Introductiones in latinam grammaticam* (Alcalá, 1523), fol. 5a.

reply to these accusations and criticism with Quintilian's words: 'Things without which greater things cannot exist are not insignificant.' Or to quote a further sentence from this author: 'No one should dismiss the elements of grammar as unimportant. Rather, those wishing to walk into the inner recesses of this temple will be shown the subtlety of things which not only sharpen the natural ability of children but also exercise them in the most profound science and erudition.'"³⁹ Likewise, in his *Repetitio V* of 1508 Nebrija declared his love for grammar, which he had always embraced and never put aside for any length of time.⁴⁰

Nebrija's arguments are echoed by other philologists of the time. Valla had already applied his grammatical training to biblical scholarship.⁴¹ Reuchlin had also been compelled to defend the value of grammar and of language studies in general for theologians. They were, he claimed, not unworthy of a learned man.⁴² Likewise, Arias Barbosa mocked those who poked fun at the grammarian: "Is it surprising that pigs reject precious stones when they are satisfied with dirt?"⁴³ Erasmus, too, defended his belief that it was legitimate for the grammarian to engage in biblical exegesis.⁴⁴

Conversely, opposition to grammarians engaging in biblical studies was of long standing and continued to be voiced. In 1421 Alfonso de Cartagena expressed a widespread opinion, when he commented on the grammarian's limitations in interpreting biblical texts: "Many men who have a very solid grounding in grammatical studies are unable to understand much of theology or law books (or books in the other sciences and arts), even though they are written in Latin, unless they are assisted by doctors who can teach them these disciplines."⁴⁵

³⁹ "Possem ego ex Quintiliano verbis ad ista respondere: *non esse parva sine quibus magna constare non possunt*, et illud eiusdem: *ne quis igitur tamquam parva fastidiat grammatices elementa, sed quia interiora huius sacri adeuntibus apparebit multa rerum subtilitas quae non modo acuere ingenia puerilia sed exercere altissimam quoque eruditionem ac scientiam possit*" (*Introductiones in latinam grammaticem*, Alcalá, 1523).

⁴⁰ "Grammaticae meae incredibilis quidam amor, quae me non sinit ab ipsius amplexibus quoquam discedere aut interim elapsum diutius aberrare."

⁴¹ Rico, *Nebrija frente a los bárbaros*, p. 26.

⁴² J. Reuchlin, *Lexicon in Hebraicum et in Hebraeorum Grammaticam Commentarii* (Basel, 1506), preface.

⁴³ Quoted in Olmedo, *Nebrija (1441–1522)*, p. 77.

⁴⁴ Preface to Lorenzo Valla's *Annotationes in Novum Testamentum*: "non ferenda temeritas hominem grammaticum post vexatas disciplinas omnes ne a sacris quidem literis petulantem abstinere calamum."

⁴⁵ R. Mascagna, ed., *La Rethórica de M. Tullio Cicerón* (Naples, 1969), p. 32; quoted in Rico, *Nebrija frente a los bárbaros*, p. 30.

In 1634 Francisco Cascales described the low esteem in which grammar was held while vindicating its reputation: “My bold decision to sing, loudly and proudly, the praises and glories of grammatical studies may appear ridiculous. The mere mention of grammar and its low reputation is enough to humiliate any arrogant grammarian, if any of them show arrogance, for many describe them as dirty pickpockets...I am well aware of all this and I humbly confess our low origin. Yet, let all wise men know that we are their parents and that they owe us their existence...without us the theologian would not tread the pavement of heaven...the physician would not have human health as his main field of study and the jurist would not be able to interpret the law.”⁴⁶

⁴⁶ Justo García Soriano, ed., *Cartas filológicas*, 3 (Madrid, 1941), pp. 40–42; J.R. Jones, “An Unpublished Lecture of Antonio de Nebrija: The Repetitio quinta of 1508,” *Studia Alabortiana* 12 (1972) 311–12.

ANTI-ERASMIANISM IN SPAIN

Alejandro Coroleu

In his account of the life and deeds of Emperor Charles V the Spanish theologian and translator Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda evoked several episodes of his long controversy with Erasmus. Sepúlveda had been engaged with the Dutch humanist in a polemic dating back to 1528, when Erasmus' *Ciceronianus* was first published. In the following years—during his stay in Rome—Sepúlveda assisted his former patron Alberto Pio in the composition of successive critiques of Erasmus' work, which culminated in his own *Antapologia pro Alberto Pio* of 1532. Despite Erasmus' shrill diatribe against Alberto Pio, Sepúlveda was advised by Pope Clement VII to keep his *Antapologia* within conciliatory terms. Alarmed by the progress of Lutheranism and aware of the pernicious effects which Machiavelli's thought could have on Christianity, the papal curia was reluctant to open a third front of hostilities and imposed restraint on Erasmus' Catholic critics.¹

Although Sepúlveda's attacks on Erasmus' ideas came to fruition during his time in Italy (a detail which accounts for his inclusion elsewhere in this volume),² his attitude encapsulates the complex and at times contradictory nature of anti-Erasmianism in Spain. As with other Spanish critics of Erasmus, Sepúlveda was forced to tread a careful path between his orthodox views, his close ties with prominent members of the imperial court (a centre of Erasmianism until the early 1530s), and the demands imposed on him by the ecclesiastical authorities. Sepúlveda's confrontation with Erasmus—whose scholarship, however, the Spaniard held in high esteem—is all the more paradoxical given his training at the University of Alcalá. Inaugurated in 1498 by Cardinal Archbishop Francisco Jiménez de Cisneros, the University of Alcalá applied the programme of humanism to its curriculum and to the study

¹ Sepúlveda, *De rebus gestis Caroli quinti*, IV, pp. 15, 31; text in *Ioannis Genesii Sepúlvedae Cordubensis Opera cum edita tum inedita* (Madrid, 1780), pp. 467–68. On Sepúlveda's deliberate "silence" on Machiavelli's texts see Alejandro Coroleu, "Il *Democrates primus* di Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda: una nuova prima condanna contro il Machiavelli," *Il Pensiero politico* 25:2 (1992), 263–268.

² Cf. Nelson Minnich's chapter below, pp. 277–95.

of Scripture, even if conservative positions within it ultimately prevailed. As early as 1508 Cardinal Jiménez himself initiated a great project of biblical scholarship which resulted in the printing between 1514 and 1517 of the six volumes of the renowned Complutensian Polyglot Bible.³ The foundation of the University had, moreover, its roots in Cardinal Jiménez's desire for religious reform.⁴ The institution became a centre for ecclesiastical education and among its professors and students were the first enthusiastic supporters of Erasmus in Spain.

CONTROVERSIES WITH LÓPEZ DE ZÚÑIGA AND CARRANZA

The University of Alcalá also equipped a group of scholars with the necessary tools to apply philological methods to sacred texts. Although aware of the problematic manuscript tradition of the Scriptures, these men were entrenched in their defence of the Vulgate. In the course of the 1520s the challenging methodology employed by Erasmus in his first edition of the New Testament (1516) led to increasingly violent attacks by conservative scholars on Erasmus' biblical studies. One such critic was Diego López de Zúñiga (Jacobus Lopis Stunica in Latin). Born around 1470 to an aristocratic family in Extremadura (he had a brother who performed high diplomatic functions for Charles V), López de Zúñiga must have taken a degree in theology at the University of Salamanca.⁵ At Salamanca he also studied Greek under Aires Barbosa prior to 1502, when he was called by Cardinal Jiménez de Cisneros to join the team of what would subsequently become the Complutensian Polyglot Bible. Although López de Zúñiga's exact role in the project cannot be fully ascertained, he recalls in the preface to his *Annotationes contra Iacobum Fabrum Stapulensem* how he was instructed by Cardinal Jiménez to collate Greek manuscripts of the Gospels with the Latin Vulgate.⁶ Testimonies by some of his contemporaries also seem to confirm that López de Zúñiga shared in the preparatory and

³ Thus named for *Complutum*, the Latin name of Alcalá de Henares. The volumes were published only in 1522.

⁴ Eugenio Asensio, "El erasmismo y las corrientes espirituales afines (conversos, franciscanos, italianizantes)," *Revista de Filología Española* 36 (1952), 31–99, esp. pp. 44–69.

⁵ Desiderius Erasmus, *Apologia respondens ad ea quae Iacobus Lopis Stunica taxaverat in prima duntaxat Novi Testamenti aeditione*, ed. H.J. de Jonge (Amsterdam-Oxford, 1983), p. 14 (hereafter cited as ASD IX–2). In the following pages I refer to Stunica as López de Zúñiga.

⁶ As argued by de Jonge in ASD IX–2, pp. 15–17.

editorial work of the Complutensian Polyglot. A letter of October 1521 by his friend Juan de Vergara suggests that he was a member of the staff of Cardinal Jiménez, “our common patron,” and remained on staff beyond the Cardinal’s death in November 1517.⁷ And according to the historian Alvar Gómez de Castro, López de Zúñiga authored part of the interlinear Latin version of the Septuagint as part of his contribution to the Alcalá edition.⁸

While López de Zúñiga and other Spanish scholars were busily preparing the Polyglot Bible, copies of Erasmus’ *Novum Instrumentum* reached Alcalá in late 1516. Juan de Vergara’s above-mentioned letter (lines 54–64) describes the impact Erasmus’ edition of the New Testament had on López de Zúñiga and the zeal with which he procured himself a copy of the volume. Unlike greater philologists of Alcalá such as Antonio de Nebrija and Hernán Núñez de Guzmán, who despite their objections to Erasmus’ *Novum Instrumentum* recognized the importance and the merits of Erasmus’ undertaking, López de Zúñiga decided to prepare a series of severely critical annotations on Erasmus’ edition. This was not López de Zúñiga’s first series of annotations on biblical texts since, a year earlier, he had published an attack on Lefèvre d’Étaples’s commentary on, and translation of, the epistles of Paul entitled *Annotationes contra Iacobum Fabrum Stapulensem* (Alcalá: Brocar, 1519). An orthodox Catholic eager to defend the Latin Vulgate, he was, after all, a competent scholar in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, and had some knowledge of Aramaic and Arabic. López de Zúñiga showed a first draft of his notes to Cisneros, who advised him to send a copy of the text to Erasmus privately and forbade its publication. After Cisneros’s death, López de Zúñiga was finally free to issue his attack on Erasmus. He did so through the press of Arnao Guillén de Brocar, printer of the Complutensian Polyglot, in an edition which was published probably before July 1520 under the title *Annotationes contra Erasmum Roterodamum in defensionem tralationis Novi Testamenti*. In August of that year López de Zúñiga went on a journey to Rome already carrying with him several printed copies of his annotations against Erasmus. Travelling at his leisure, he arrived in Rome in February of the following year and published a vivid account of his journey entitled

⁷ Allen 4, Appendix 15, 4, Ep. 1: 56: “cum esses sub nomine reverendissimi domini Cardinalis, communis patroni.”

⁸ Alvar Gómez de Castro, *De rebus gestis a Francisco Ximénio Cisnerio* (Alcalá, 1569), fol. 86r.

Itinerarium ab Hispania. He stayed on in Italy until his death and never returned to Spain.

Shortly after his arrival in Rome, López de Zúñiga secured a teaching position in Greek at the University of La Sapienza. While in Italy, he fostered relations with powerful men by seeking the protection of both the papal curia and the imperial court. In January 1522 he published, for example, an *Epistola* to the recently elected Adrian VI (Rome: n.p.). He also enjoyed the hospitality of Cardinal Bernardino de Carvajal and accompanied his patron Cardinal Francisco de Quiñones in the welcoming party which greeted Charles V at Genoa in August 1529. He remained in the environment of the imperial court in Northern Italy until 1530, when he returned to Rome. It is at this time that he addressed a lengthy *Consilium* to Clement VII advising the pope on the perils of Lutheranism.⁹ During his stay in Italy he also wrote a *Hispanicarum historiarum breviarium*, which is only preserved in manuscript.¹⁰

The circumstances surrounding López de Zúñiga's death on a visit to Naples in the first half of 1531 are described by Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda in his *Antapologia pro Alberto Pio*.¹¹ As a close friend of López de Zúñiga and secretary to Cardinal Quiñones, Sepúlveda was also well aware of López de Zúñiga's plans regarding his unpublished papers.¹² In a letter to Erasmus of 1 April 1532 Sepúlveda tells of López de Zúñiga's wish to bequeath his long-announced annotations on Erasmus' scholia on the epistles of Jerome, and on Erasmus' fourth edition of the New Testament (1527) to Quiñones with precise instructions that they were to be conveyed to Erasmus.¹³ According to Sepúlveda, upon receiving the material, Quiñones forwarded it to

⁹ The manuscript was edited by Stephan Ehse in *Römische Quartalschrift* 8 (1894), 473–92.

¹⁰ On this text see Leticia Carrasco Reija, "El género historiográfico de los sumarios en el humanismo español: el *Hispanicarum historiarum breviarium* de Diego López de Zúñiga," in Ana María Aldama et al., eds., *La Filología Latina hoy: actualización y perspectivas* (Madrid, 1999), pp. 817–27.

¹¹ Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda, *Antapologia pro Alberto Pio, comite Carpensi*, in *Erasmum Rotterodamum*, ed. Julián Solana Pujalte (Pozoblanco, 2003), p. 137 (chapter 32): "Mortuus est enim Neapoli, quam urbem ut inviseret paulo ante profectus erat Roma." López de Zúñiga's death has been dated to the first half of 1531 by de Jonge in *ASD* IX-2, p. 33.

¹² Shortly after López de Zúñiga's death Sepúlveda wrote an epigram in memory of his friend, which he included in a letter to Íñigo de Mendoza y Zúñiga, reproduced in *Ioannis Genesii Sepulvedae epistolarum libri septem*, 2:1 (Salamanca, 1557), fols. 35v–36v.

¹³ Allen, Ep. 2637.

him who in turn passed it to Íñigo de Mendoza y Zúñiga, the bishop of Burgos. López de Zúñiga's annotations eventually reached Erasmus some time before 17 February 1534, as acknowledged by the latter in a letter to Sepúlveda.¹⁴

The last decade of López de Zúñiga's life was spent on a long and bitter polemic with Erasmus.¹⁵ Throughout these years the Spanish scholar met with little sympathy for his campaign despite his influential contacts in Italian circles. Silence was imposed on him by Popes Leo X, Adrian VI, and Clement VII, and in 1522 a resolution was passed by the papal curia prohibiting the sale of his books in Rome. This was chiefly because of the violence of López de Zúñiga's attacks against the Dutch humanist and because of the narrow chauvinism exhibited by the Spaniard in his texts. The latter is indeed a distinctive feature in the *Annotationes* against Erasmus. As an example, discussion of Erasmus' note on Romans 15:24 concerning the spelling of the Greek word for Spain (*Spania*) led López de Zúñiga to respond to what he perceived as criticism of Spain's cultural backwardness on the part of Erasmus with a robust defence of his country's contribution to human learning. In order to refute the arrogant accusations of the *homo batavus*, López de Zúñiga boasted that he could provide numerous examples of illustrious Spanish philologists who bore comparison with their contemporary European counterparts,¹⁶ yet only mentioned Hernán Núñez de Guzmán and the *converso* Pablo Coronel, who had prepared the text of the Old Testament for the Complutensian Bible.¹⁷

National pride was not, however, the main motive which led López de Zúñiga to embark on his campaign against Erasmus. As early as 1511 he had taken offence at Erasmus' irreverent remarks in the *Praise of Folly*. López de Zúñiga's disdain for the Dutch humanist therefore predated the publication of the *Novum Instrumentum*. Yet, as he declared in the opening paragraphs of his *Annotationes*, not only was Erasmus' new version of the Gospels unnecessary on philological grounds but (and this was more worrisome) it undermined Christian

¹⁴ Allen, Ep. 2905.

¹⁵ Useful accounts of their controversy can be found in Erika Rummel, *Erasmus and his Catholic Critics*, 1 (Nieuwkoop, 1988), pp. 145–77, and Richard H. Graham, "Erasmus and Stunica: A Chapter in the History of New Testament Scholarship," *Erasmus of Rotterdam Society Yearbook* 10 (1990), 9–60.

¹⁶ López de Zúñiga, *Annotationes contra Erasmus rotterdamum, in defensionem tralationis Novi Testamenti* (Alcalá, 1520) fol. c3v.

¹⁷ Zúñiga, *Annotationes*, fol. f3v.

orthodoxy. He therefore felt that both Erasmus' decision to publish a new translation of the whole New Testament and his unjust condemnation of the Vulgate demanded a firm response. After accusing Erasmus of undue ambition, López de Zúñiga proceeded to comment on a large selection of passages from Erasmus' version and annotations. Rather fastidiously he pointed out Erasmus' misprints and lapses in translation, and ridiculed his excessive attention to style. Not all queries by López de Zúñiga were, however, ill-founded. With hindsight he was sound in questioning some of Erasmus' criteria since we now know that Erasmus' Latin version was based on Greek manuscripts which represented an inferior stage of transmission.¹⁸ López de Zúñiga was also right—as Erasmus would uniquely concede—on some minor points such as in locating the Neapolis of Acts 16:11 in Thracia and not in Caria.¹⁹ Yet López de Zúñiga's strong rebuke of Erasmus's New Testament scholarship was in the end stirred by his desire to defend the foundations of theology and of the church. Although he did not formally label his adversary a heretic (a charge he would however make explicit in later works), he claimed that Erasmus' *Annotations* "contained the seed of impiety."²⁰

Erasmus did not wait long to react to López de Zúñiga's *Annotationes* and in October 1521 the Leuven printer Dirk Martens issued a copy of the *Apologia respondens ad ea quae Iacobus Lopis Stunica taxaverat in prima duntaxat Novi Testamenti aeditione*. In his apology Erasmus replied to the 221 queries listed by his opponent, mostly in a condescending and sarcastic manner. From the outset he belittled López de Zúñiga's contributions, often by pointing to instances within other controversies in which he had already justified his philological criteria. In some cases Erasmus acknowledged Nebrija's criticism, but excused himself from engaging in an argument with López de Zúñiga or opted to refer the Spaniard to his own dispute with Edward Lee.²¹ Despite his ironic tone and apparent indifference Erasmus must have taken López de Zúñiga's comments as a serious threat to his reputation. In one of his annotations on Matthew (26:31) he protested his orthodoxy and insisted that

¹⁸ ASD IX-2, pp. 19–20.

¹⁹ ASD IX-2, p. 156: 867.

²⁰ Zúñiga, *Annotationes*, fol. e1r.

²¹ ASD IX-2, p. 206: 715–16: "Nihil hic respondeo Stunicae, cum multa possim. Res est illi cum Valla, non mecum," and ASD IX-2, p. 82: 477: "iam ipse Leo respondi". Erasmus gave credit to Nebrija's *Tertia quinquagena* in ASD IX-2, p. 114: 98. For a discussion of Erasmus' dispute with Lee see Cecilia Asso's chapter below, pp. 167–95.

he held Jerome's enterprise in the highest esteem: "I follow the authority of no other writer more scrupulously than that of Jerome. And I give him so much credit that some writers have even given me trouble for being more favourable to him than is just... And immediately López de Zúñiga sings the praises of Jerome, having borrowed certain words from the eulogy in which I celebrate his praises not only in one place but with far more zeal and abundance than López de Zúñiga does here."²²

Just as Erasmus was supported by other scholars, López de Zúñiga also found some assistance for his cause. This came chiefly from his fellow-countrymen, most notably from Antonio de Nebrija and from Sancho Carranza de Miranda, who died in 1531. A graduate of the University of Paris, Carranza had taught arts and theology at the University of Alcalá (where Sepúlveda had been one of his most conspicuous students) before travelling to Rome in 1520 on a mission for the Spanish church. Two years after his arrival in Rome he published his *Opusculum in quasdam Erasmi Roterodami annotationes*, which he dedicated to Juan de Vergara in the hope that the latter would intervene on his behalf with Erasmus. Accordingly Vergara wrote to Erasmus explaining the scholarly intention of the *Opusculum* and pointing to the moderate language displayed by Carranza in his work.²³ Indeed, the polite and respectful tone of Carranza's writing is obvious from the initial paragraphs of the *Opusculum*. In his dedicatory letter to Vergara, Carranza declared his admiration (almost veneration) for Erasmus while courteously inviting him to explain more clearly some of the points previously made in his own response to López de Zúñiga's annotations, "in order to close the mouths of the murmurers."²⁴

In reality, however, Carranza's critique would be much harsher than the author let on. Since Erasmus' doctorate in theology had been conferred "*per saltum*," the Spaniard expressed suspicions concerning his opponent's lack of formal academic training. He also condemned Erasmus' unnecessary emphasis on style and use of improper (that is, non-scholastic) terminology. Alarmed by all this, Carranza wrote his

²² ASD IX-2, 108: 974-79.

²³ Allen, Ep. 1277.

²⁴ *Sancti Carranzae a Mirandola theologi opusculum in quasdam Erasmi Roterodami annotationes* (Rome, 1522), fol. a1r: "...in illis locis explicaret sententiam ut maledicorum obstrueret ora. Quod ad me attinet, ego veneror Erasmum..." On Carranza see José Ignacio Tellechea Idígoras, *El Arzobispo Carranza y su tiempo* (Madrid, 1968).

Opusculum determined to teach the Dutch humanist a lesson in theology. The core of his tract is a defence of three accusations included in López de Zúñiga's *Annotationes*, which—according to Carranza—Erasmus had failed to address in a satisfactory manner in his reply to López de Zúñiga. The passages under discussion—concerning John 1:1, Acts 4:27, and Eph. 5:32—were all the more relevant because Erasmus' insufficient reply had done nothing to dispel doubts as to his orthodoxy on three specific points: whether Christ's divinity is clearly conveyed in the Scriptures; whether the epithet "servant" is applicable to Christ; and whether the sacramental nature of matrimony is stated in Paul's letter to the Ephesians. This last issue had serious implications—in Carranza's eyes—for Erasmus' translation of the Greek *mysterion* by *mysterium* (mystery) rather than the conventional *sacramentum* (sacrament) and was in the end responsible for Luther's denial of the sacrament of matrimony. Although he did not accuse Erasmus of heresy but proclaimed him *catholicus et orthodoxus* (fol. 18v), Carranza lamented that Erasmus' exegesis of Eph. 5:32 had equipped "the most unfortunate heretic of our time" with arguments to deny that matrimony was a sacrament. Carranza therefore urged Erasmus to state more clearly than he had done in his first apology against López de Zúñiga his position on this matter.

Erasmus did so promptly by writing his own reply, the *Apologia de tribus locis quos ut recte taxatos a Stunica defenderat Sanctius Carranza theologus* (June 1522).²⁵ Skeptical about the Spaniard's protestations of goodwill and derisive of his critic's methodology, Erasmus set out to answer Carranza's queries, accusing him of having deliberately misunderstood his arguments. By proposing, for example, the word "son" for the Greek term *pais* in Acts 4:27, he had not questioned the divine nature of Christ and favoured Arianism, as insinuated by Carranza, but had simply discussed terminology. Similarly, he had not denied the sacramental nature of matrimony but pointed to the ambivalence of the Greek word *mysterion*, which could mean both "mystery" and "sacrament." All the cases adduced by Carranza—Erasmus concluded—rested solely on philological grounds, and they did not constitute a challenge to dogmatic points. Carranza did not continue the controversy, and

²⁵ Erasmus' reply was published alongside his *Epistola de esu carnum* (Basel, 6 August 1522). The edition also included Carranza's original booklet as well as Erasmus' own *Apologia adversus libellum Stunicae cui titulum fecit Blasphemiae et impietates Erasmi*, together with his *Apologia ad Prodromon Stunicae*.

relations between the two men improved. Carranza went as far as to intervene in favour of Erasmus at the Council of Valladolid of 1527, noting that Erasmus' meaning was orthodox, "although this mode of expression is not used by modern theologians."²⁶

Erasmus' assurance—at the end of his *Annotations* against López de Zúñiga—that the Spaniard "shall not have an antagonist in me in the future" soon proved to be premature.²⁷ Months before a copy of Erasmus' defence reached López de Zúñiga in Rome, the latter had already completed a second attack on Erasmus. On 9 January 1522 he informed Juan de Vergara that, with a wealth of Greek texts at his disposal in Rome, he had written a new pamphlet against Erasmus "siendo como es [Erasmus] tan impio y tan blasphemo."²⁸ Not surprisingly, insinuations of impiety and blasphemy formed the bulk of López de Zúñiga's *Erasmi Roterodami blasphemiae et impietates*, an abridged version of a manuscript the publication of which Pope Leo X had forbidden before his death in December 1521. In spite of an edict by the cardinals in Rome, the text was published by Antonius Bladus at Rome some time between 7 April and 4 May 1522. Arranged under various subject headings, the *Blasphemiae et impietates* included a collection of Erasmian passages (significantly, not limited to texts dealing with biblical scholarship) which López de Zúñiga considered dangerous to the faith and to the church. As Vergara was warned in a letter of 4 May 1522, reading of the *Blasphemiae et impietates* would clearly expose Erasmus' agreements "with Arius, with Appollinarism, with Jovinian, with the Hussites and the Wycliffites, and ultimately with Luther himself."²⁹

Determined to deny Erasmus the opportunity to launch a quick counter-attack, López de Zúñiga persisted in his offensive with the *Libellus trium illorum voluminum praecursor, quibus Erasmicas impietates ac blasphemias redarguit*.³⁰ López de Zúñiga's new pamphlet referred to previous episodes in his polemic with Erasmus by focusing on the three annotations already dealt with by Carranza in his *Opusculum*. In the *Praecursor* López de Zúñiga announced the imminent publication of three books (as originally planned) of *Blasphemiae et impietates* and invited his opponent

²⁶ Rummel, *Erasmus and his Catholic Critics*, 2, p. 91.

²⁷ ASD IX-2, p. 266: 641.

²⁸ Allen 4, App. XV, IV, Ep. 2, p. 626: 51.

²⁹ Allen 4, App. XV, IV, Ep. 4, p. 630: 7-9.

³⁰ López de Zúñiga, *Libellus trium illorum voluminum praecursor, quibus Erasmicas impietates ac blasphemias redarguit* (Rome, March-July 1522).

to proof that he opposed the Lutheran stance.³¹ A copy of López de Zúñiga's booklet reached Erasmus when his reply to the *Blasphemiae et impietates* was already in press in June 1522. He immediately added an appendix under the title *Apologia ad Prodromon Stunicae*.³²

Erasmus' alleged ties with Luther were the subject of a further attack penned by López de Zúñiga, who succeeded in circumventing the papal prohibition to launch assaults on Erasmus. A text of only five pages, the *Conclusiones principaliter suspectae et scandalosae quae reperiuntur in libris Erasmi* follows López de Zúñiga's customary practice of grouping "suspect" passages (often misquoted or deliberately misinterpreted) from Erasmus' works under general headings such as papal authority, matrimony, and ceremonies.³³ The brevity of López de Zúñiga's booklet did not prevent Erasmus from refuting the accusations one by one in his *Apologia ad Stunicae Conclusiones*, published in Basel by Froben in March 1524 alongside the *Exomologesis*. Concerned about his own reputation and annoyed by his adversary's stubbornness, Erasmus even pleaded with Pope Clement VII, who agreed to arbitrate the case and pronounce in his favour.³⁴ The papal intervention only spurred López de Zúñiga to publish in 1524—albeit without printer's name or place of publication—two more pamphlets against Erasmus: the *Assertio ecclesiasticae translationis Novi Testamenti a soloecismis quos illi Erasmus Roterodamus impeggerat* and the *Loca quae ex Stunicae annotationibus, illius suppresso nomine, in tertia editione Novi Testamenti emendavit*. Dealing with an index added by Erasmus to his second edition of the New Testament of 1519, the *Assertio* touched upon matters of style and defended the Latinity of forty-two passages in the Vulgate, which Erasmus had labelled as solecisms. In the *Loca* the discussion returned to the early stages of the controversy between both contenders and focused again on scholarly texts rather than on matters of doctrine. In his text López de Zúñiga listed all the revisions in the third edition of Erasmus' annotations on the New Testament (1522), which he made on the Spaniard's advice but without acknowledging the source. Erasmus' reaction to López de Zúñiga's final attacks and complaints was silence, interrupted only in

³¹ For the textual history of the manuscript and printed versions of the *Blasphemiae et impietates* see Rummel, *Erasmus and his Catholic Critics*, 1, pp. 168–70.

³² See n. 15 above.

³³ López de Zúñiga, *Conclusiones principaliter suspectae et scandalosae quae reperiuntur in libris Erasmi* (Rome, 1523).

³⁴ Allen, Ep. 1418.

1529, when he came across a copy of the *Assertio* among his papers in Freiburg and decided to defend himself in the form of a letter to Hubertus Barlandus.³⁵

Erasmus' assiduity in replying to López de Zúñiga is a clear indication of the seriousness with which he regarded the Spaniard's attacks on him. Erasmus' claim that he was unperturbed by his opponent is difficult to believe given his deep concern with his own reputation and position.³⁶ In 1528, long after the polemics with Carranza and López de Zúñiga had come to an end, Erasmus was still troubled by the criticisms endured at the hands of this group of Spanish biblical scholars.³⁷ By then, however, fresher and more virulent assaults against him had been launched in Spain. Erasmus' worries lay now not only with those who disputed his philological acumen, but with those who objected to his entire religious programme. With hindsight, López de Zúñiga's persistent attacks between 1520 and 1524 had given Erasmus a taste of what was to come a few years later. For, in selecting excerpts from Erasmus' works and in criticizing his biblical scholarship and views on church and doctrine, the Spanish theologian had foreshadowed some of the tactics employed by several delegates at the Valladolid Conference of 1527.³⁸

EDWARD LEE IN SPAIN

In Spain Erasmus' message was transmitted not only through academic institutions such as Alcalá. With the arrival of the Flemish court of the first Habsburg king of Spain in 1516, Erasmianism was to make a meteoric impact on Spanish society. In the early years of Charles V's reign the most devoted disciples of Erasmus were men deeply involved with the imperial court. Particularly receptive to Erasmian ideas was the influential lobby of humanists gathered around the emperor and led by Juan de Valdés and his brother Alfonso, secretary for Latin correspondence at the imperial court and *erasmicior Erasmo*. In addition, in the

³⁵ Allen, Ep. 2172.

³⁶ Allen, Ep. 1337, l. 6. See also Lisa Jardine, *Erasmus, Man of Letters: The Construction of Charisma in Print* (Princeton, 1993).

³⁷ Erasmus included references to Nebrija, Carranza and López de Zúñiga in the *Ciceronianus* (see ASD I.2, pp. 690–91).

³⁸ Marcel Bataillon, *Erasmo y España: estudios sobre la historia espiritual del siglo XVI* (Mexico-Buenos Aires, 1966), p. 125.

1520s many of Erasmus' works—issued chiefly from the Complutensian imprint of Miguel de Eguía—were translated into the vernacular, thus contributing to the popularity of his ideas. In 1526 Alfonso Fernández de Madrid, the archdeacon of Alcor, who had undertaken the translation of the *Enchiridion militis Christiani* two years earlier, wrote triumphantly to Erasmus that, whereas formerly the text had been read by the few who were skilled in Latin, “there is now hardly anyone who does not have in hand the Spanish version in the imperial court, in cities, in churches, in monasteries, and even in inns.”³⁹ A letter of September 1527 from the humanist Juan Maldonado to Erasmus, praising his impact upon Spaniards, evinces the confident enthusiasm which Erasmus' supporters in Spain at the time possessed.⁴⁰

Maldonado's optimistic assessment soon proved, however, to be rather ill-founded. As early as 1526 Erasmus—who was in touch with a number of Spanish scholars and churchmen—was warned that he had enemies even within the imperial court. He was well aware that the emperor's confessor, the Dominican García de Loaysa, was scheming against him. Citing the reports of friends, Erasmus also complained about the activities of his old enemy Edward Lee, who had acted as ambassador of Henry VIII to Spain since 1525. Indeed Erasmus' correspondence from that year includes frequent references to Lee's alleged intrigues at the imperial court, and in particular to his efforts to have the *Annotations* of 1520 reissued. This led Erasmus to lodge a complaint with the imperial chancellor Mercurio Gattinara: “I have been informed by certain people through letters that Edward Lee, who acts as ambassador of his king at your court, is preparing to publish a book with shameless attacks on me, or has perhaps already published it.”⁴¹ The chancellor's promise that Lee would not be allowed to publish anything damaging to his reputation did not calm Erasmus' suspicions. A letter of November 1527 testifies to his belief that Lee—through the dissemination of his book—had been collaborating with the Spanish monks, “who foolishly think of me as their enemy.”⁴² He was convinced that Lee had provided them with a series of manuscript notes, far richer than those published in 1520; it was otherwise impossible that

³⁹ Allen, Ep. 1904.

⁴⁰ Allen, Ep. 1742.

⁴¹ Rummel, *Erasmus and his Catholic Critics*, 2, p. 85.

⁴² Allen, Ep. 1902.

the *ventres*—those “fatbellies,” as he labelled them—could have read everything they quoted in their reports at Valladolid.⁴³

Erika Rummel has shown that Erasmus’ suspicions about Lee’s machinations were correct.⁴⁴ Yet distrust and resentment among the religious orders were fostered not only by Lee’s intrigues. Even those who called themselves supporters of Erasmus were inadvertently contributing to his unpopularity with the friars. Alfonso Fernández’s translation of the *Enchiridion* gave ample ammunition to Franciscans and Dominicans, who were growing increasingly hostile to Erasmus’ ideas and words. And, despite his good intentions, at Salamanca the theologian and Benedictine monk Alonso Ruiz de Virués antagonized Erasmus’ critics by publishing a sample of the *Colloquia* in translation, which he prefaced with a letter to the Franciscan warden at Alcalá urging him to stop his attacks against Erasmus. He spread further confusion as to the orthodoxy of Erasmus’ thought when he sent a copy of his *Collationes septem* to Erasmus, asking for clarification concerning a series of passages in his works.

THE VALLADOLID CONFERENCE OF 1527

Confusion, suspicion, and irritation soon led to a period of outright confrontation between Erasmus and the Spanish monastic orders. In the early months of 1527 Pope Clement VII instructed the Inquisitor General, Alonso Manrique, to undertake a formal investigation of Erasmus’ writings. Representatives from the Dominicans, Franciscans, and Benedictines were required by Manrique to report “on whether there was something wrong or dangerous in Erasmus’ works.”⁴⁵ Alongside scholars from the universities of Salamanca, Alcalá, and Valladolid they were subsequently summoned to a conference in Valladolid, which was to determine the orthodoxy of Erasmus’ views. Erasmus was informed shortly afterwards by his Spanish followers of the propositions presented to Manrique. On 13 March the Valencian Pere Joan Oliver (Pedro Juan Oliver in Spanish) wrote to him enclosing the articles of the churchmen

⁴³ Allen, Ep. 1903.

⁴⁴ Erika Rummel, “New Perspectives on the Controversy between Erasmus and Lee,” *Nederlandsch Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis* 74 (1994), 226–32, esp. pp. 230–231.

⁴⁵ Allen, Ep. 1814.

who were to assemble at Valladolid.⁴⁶ Preparations for the conference were already underway in late April 1527, as reported by Juan Vergara in a long letter to Erasmus.⁴⁷

With great solemnity the assembly of theologians finally opened on 27 June. Detailed minutes of the meetings were kept by the secretary Juan García. Until 13 August, when the plague forced Manrique to adjourn the meetings, it convened three times a week, on Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Saturdays. The number of theologians present at the conference oscillated between twenty-seven and thirty. Opinion about Erasmus' orthodoxy among them was divided almost equally, and delegates tended to vote according to their religious or academic affiliation.⁴⁸ On the whole Dominicans and Franciscans pronounced against Erasmus, while the other orders displayed benevolence towards him. Among the theologians of Alcalá, the Aragonese Pedro Sánchez Ciruelo was the only one to declare his opposition to Erasmus. In so doing he aligned himself with the Salamancan group of representatives. With important exceptions such as Antonio de Alcaraz, professor of Philosophy, and of Alonso Enríquez, warden of the University and nephew of the admiral of Castile, delegates from Valladolid were passionately anti-Erasmian.

Only four of the twenty-two propositions subject to the inquisitorial investigation were dealt with at Valladolid. The conference progressed in such slow manner because the delegates—men trained in the scholastic tradition—insisted on reviewing time and again the same texts from different angles. In addition, rather than setting the passages under dispute in a wider context and relating them to other Erasmian writings, the theologians deliberately preferred to focus on isolated phrases and words. The failure to move the discussions forward and to reach a verdict was in the end a consequence of the method and the background of the delegates involved, irrespective of their pro- or anti-Erasmian leaning.⁴⁹ Opinions within the conference ranged from those dictated by outright condemnation of Erasmus' thought or by

⁴⁶ Allen, Ep. 1791. On Oliver's Erasmianism see Milagros Rivera, "Pedro Juan Olivar," in CEBR 3, pp. 31–32.

⁴⁷ Allen, Ep. 1814.

⁴⁸ For a discussion of the background to the delegates present at Valladolid see Miguel Avilés Fernández, "Erasmus y los teólogos españoles," in *El erasmismo en España*, eds. Manuel Revuelta Sañudo and Ciriaco Morón Arroyo (Santander, 1986), pp. 175–93, at pp. 183–91.

⁴⁹ Bataillon, *Erasmus y España*, p. 265.

concern about the terminology he employed, to those which reflected praise for his scholarship and writings. All in all, at least fourteen votes openly favourable to Erasmus were recorded by Alfonso de Valdés.⁵⁰

The outbreak of plague notwithstanding, we are well informed about the contents of the articles that were never discussed from Erasmus' own apology. Had the meetings not been discontinued, the delegates would have voted on Erasmus' pronouncements on points such as papal authority, the sacraments, the authority of the Church Fathers, ceremonies, veneration of saints, and indulgences, among others. The only four items that were actually discussed were Erasmus' statements on the Trinity, the divine nature of Christ, the divine nature of the Holy Ghost, and the power of the inquisition. For each individual proposition the theologians gathered suspect passages mainly drawn from Erasmus' *Annotations*, but also from the *Paraphrases*, the *Enchiridion* and the *Colloquia*. In some cases they even submitted entire works. As an example, the colloquy *Inquisitio de fide* was presented by Erasmus' critics as proof of his unorthodox views concerning the punishment of heretics. Invoking Saint Paul's old adage "Bad conversation corrupts morals" (*Corrumpunt bonos mores colloquia prava*), they adduced the irreverent contents of the *Inquisitio de fide* to condemn the *Colloquies* as a whole.⁵¹

A brief examination of the proceedings regarding the first two propositions will give us an insight into the arguments and methods employed by the delegates. The first article, entitled *Contra sacrosanctam Trinitatem*, invited delegates to comment on Erasmus' assertions concerning the Trinity. On this particular point, the theologians accused Erasmus of relying on corrupt manuscripts and of attempting to undermine the authority of Jerome. They also saw in him a supporter of Arianism. Such serious charges stemmed from Erasmus' omission of the so called "Johannine comma" in the first of the epistles of St John (1 John 5:7), a verse which runs: "For there are three that bear witness in heaven, the Father, the Word and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one." Although the passage occurred in Jerome's Latin translation of the Bible, it was not extant in most Greek manuscripts. Invoking the testimony of codex *Vaticanus B*, in which the verse was also missing, Erasmus—as the Court chaplain Fray Gil López pointed out—had rightly excluded

⁵⁰ Allen, Ep. 1839.

⁵¹ Bataillon, *Erasmus y España*, pp. 262–63.

it from his first edition of the New Testament. Conversely, in their defence of what they thought to be Jerome's version scholars in the anti-Erasmian camp resorted to the authority of the canon and therefore deemed as corrupt all those manuscripts on which Erasmus' exclusion of the Johannine testimony was based. As an example, in his report the Portuguese Diogo de Gouvea, a graduate of Paris, boldly drew on the testimonies employed by the editors of the Complutensian Polyglot, who had gone so far as to add the Latin passage in translation to the Greek text.⁵² At Valladolid the controversy concerning the "Johannine comma" went, however, well beyond the confines of textual criticism. Enraged by Erasmus' attitude towards Jerome, Gouvea also felt entitled to comment cynically on Erasmus' morals during his time in Paris.

The second proposition (*Contra divinitatem, dignitatem et gloriam*) referred to those passages in which Erasmus—so the friars claimed—had cast doubt on the divinity of Christ. The delegates were not overtly troubled by Erasmus' daring innovations in terminology, even if these included key terms such as *hypocrisis* (Rom. 8:3) or *sermo* (a change from *verbum* at John 1:1). Their main concern lay, instead, with Christ's *appellatio*, an issue which united defenders and critics of Erasmus alike. Both sides criticized what they perceived as deliberate ambiguity on Erasmus' part, when he spoke of Christ "being called" God. This was clearly an assertion bordering on Arianism. Once again, in accusing Erasmus of heresy, the delegates were resorting to their usual tactics of paraphrasing rather than quoting, and of corrupting the meaning of some of Erasmus' statements.⁵³

Aware of the political tensions that an anti-Erasmian verdict could ignite, only two weeks after articles three and four had been discussed, Alonso Manrique resolved to adjourn the meetings at Valladolid without a formal conclusion. This was rapidly interpreted by the pro-Erasmian side as a cessation of hostilities and as victory for their arguments. The battle however continued and the two camps involved used the short truce ensuing the dispute to strengthen their cases. While the religious orders began to disseminate the findings of the conference informally,

⁵² On the practices of the editors of the Alcalá Bible see J.H. Bentley, *Humanists and Holy Writ: New Testament Scholarship in the Renaissance* (Princeton, 1983), pp. 70–111, and, above all, Alfonso Sáenz-Badillos Pérez, *La filología bíblica en los primeros helenistas de Alcalá* (Estella, 1990).

⁵³ Bataillon, *Erasmus y España*, pp. 256–57.

ardent admirers of Erasmus such as Diego Osorio demanded a public apology from the Inquisitorial Council.

ERASMUS AND SPANISH MONASTICISM

Erasmus himself also moved swiftly. In a carefully composed epistle of 2 September 1527 to Charles V he complained about the manner in which his writings had been examined at Valladolid.⁵⁴ The emperor's reply three months later giving Erasmus assurance that "there is no risk in my having permitted an inquisition into your books" did little to assure him.⁵⁵ By then, as attested by a letter of 23 August to Robert Aldridge, Erasmus had already decided to refute the contents of the Valladolid Articles point by point.⁵⁶ A draft of Erasmus' planned defence, under the title *Gustus responsionis ad articulos a monachis notatos*, was sent to Manrique in early September 1527.⁵⁷ Contrary to the advice from the Inquisitor General, Erasmus proceeded with his *Apologia ad monachos Hispanos*, which was published in Basel in the autumn of 1527.⁵⁸

In his response to the Spanish friars Erasmus' first concern was to invalidate the mode in which his critics' arguments had been presented. Defending his orthodoxy, he declared that his opponents had not observed correct procedure. Thus, to the accusation of his indulgence in and tolerance towards heresy, Erasmus replied by arguing that his words had been taken out of context and that his censors had paraphrased his statements. He claimed never to have said that capital punishment should not be inflicted on heretics. Rather, he had only advocated preventive measures towards heresy in order to cure it before heretics had to be put to death if no other remedies were effective.⁵⁹ As for the contents of the charges, Erasmus complained that his points had been deliberately misunderstood. He argued, for example, that his censors were mistaken in their belief that he had questioned articles of faith. As pointed out by Erasmus, articles of faith were based on clear scriptural

⁵⁴ Allen, Ep. 1876.

⁵⁵ Allen, Ep. 1920.

⁵⁶ Allen, Ep. 1858.

⁵⁷ Allen, Ep. 1877.

⁵⁸ The *Apologia* is included in LB IX, pp. 1015–1094. On the text see Miguel Avilés Fernández, *Erasmus y la Inquisición: El Libelo de Valladolid y la Apología de Erasmo contra los frailes españoles* (Madrid, 1980), pp. 107–39.

⁵⁹ LB IX, 1054B and 1056B.

evidence, established creed, and the decisions of universal synods.⁶⁰ In many cases he also defended himself by reminding his critics that his opinions concerned issues which were still awaiting the final verdict of the church. Similarly, he frequently noted that the views conveyed in his writings were supported by the authority of Jerome or Augustine, “the fountainhead and parent of all scholastic theology on which those who raise this fuss particularly pride themselves.”⁶¹

Although Erasmus dismissed the contents of the Valladolid Articles as “drivel and slander”⁶² and accused the Spanish monks of stupidity, malice, and ignorance, he clearly did not take the matter lightly. Indeed Erasmus’ thorough reply to the pronouncements of his critics throws some doubts on the trustworthiness of his words regarding the substance of the articles. First and foremost, he saw in the invective at the hands of the religious orders a renewal of the old controversies with López de Zúñiga and Lee, whom he even accused of having inspired the friars. Moreover, he was not by any means oblivious to the socio-economic implications underlying monasticism well beyond matters of doctrine. In a letter of 24 April 1527, his friend Juan de Vergara had reminded Erasmus that the shrill attack against the Dutch humanist on the part of the mendicant orders was ultimately fuelled by fears of losing important economic privileges.⁶³ More importantly, pleas from Spanish friends made him painfully aware of the delicate state of Erasmianism in Spain at the time and the opportunity of launching a counter-attack, when his cause still enjoyed the favour of the imperial court.

A late example of the virulent arguments revolving around monasticism in Spain is provided by the controversy between Erasmus and the Franciscan Luis de Carvajal. Born about 1500, Carvajal studied at Salamanca and at an early age was sent to the University of Paris, where he completed his education under, among others, the reform-minded theologian Josse Clichtove.⁶⁴ On his return to Spain Carvajal published a defence of the religious orders entitled *Apologia vitae monasticae diluens nugae Erasmi* (Salamanca: n.p. 1528), which was reprinted

⁶⁰ Ibid. 1091C.

⁶¹ Ibid. 1058D–E. Cf. Rummel, *Erasmus and his Catholic Critics*, 2, pp. 94–95.

⁶² LB IX, 1082A.

⁶³ Allen, Ep. 1814, l. 379.

⁶⁴ On Clichtove’s teaching at Paris see Ann Moss, *Renaissance Truth and the Latin Language Turn* (Oxford, 2003), pp. 92–103. Cf. also pp. 138–40.

a year later in Paris.⁶⁵ In the dedicatory letter to the reader, Carvajal aligned himself with a group of scholars trained in the scholastic tradition who had already made Erasmus accountable for his remarks on a number of issues. He therefore decided to restrict himself to Erasmus' attacks on monasticism. Particularly serious in this respect was the Dutch humanist's assertion that the religious orders were human regulations and had not been divinely instituted. Rather craftily, in the opening sections of his *Apologia* Carvajal attempted to offset Erasmus' claim by setting the rise of the mendicant orders in the Middle Ages in its historical context while stating the divine origins of religious life.⁶⁶ Equally offensive in the eyes of Carvajal were Erasmus' accusations of unsophisticated and inelegant Latin launched at members of the monastic orders. They were based, Carvajal claimed, on Erasmus' ignorance and excessive attention to the *bonae litterae* to the detriment of theology. Recalling the precepts of his mentor Clichtove, "Parisiensis scholae facile princeps," and evoking the quattrocento polemic between Giovanni Pico della Mirandola and Ermolao Barbaro on the merits of philosophy and rhetoric, Carvajal insisted on the need to reconcile the study of classical languages with the pursuit of theology, which however deserved the highest palm among all disciplines.⁶⁷

In his *Apologia* Luis de Carvajal opted to pay attention to nine passages from Erasmus' writings, which he deemed offensive to the monastic orders. Relevant as they were, the issue chosen by Carvajal and the corpus of texts selected by him were only a pretext used by the Spanish Franciscan to cast aspersions on Erasmus. It would however be all too easy to dismiss the methods and arguments employed by Carvajal in his battle against Erasmus as insignificant. For Carvajal's attacks were well in tune with the tactics deployed by most Spanish critics of the Dutch humanist in the wake of Erasmus' New Testament edition of 1516. Moreover, in spite of their occasionally openly hostile tone, Carvajal—like other Spanish antierasmians—made defensible and, in some cases, even valid points.

⁶⁵ For a fuller discussion of the controversy between Carvajal and Erasmus see Bataillon, *Erasmus y España*, pp. 318–28, and Rummel, *Erasmus and his Catholic Critics*, 2, pp. 99–104.

⁶⁶ Luis de Carvajal, *Apologia vitae monasticae diluens nugae Erasmi* (Salamanca, 1528), fols. 4v–5r.

⁶⁷ Carvajal, *Apologia*, fols. 27v–29v.

Although disagreements between followers of Erasmus and anti-erasmians were primarily rooted in the debate between scholastics and biblical humanists, in Spain the polemics between the two camps went well beyond issues of method. Clearly aspects of the dispute between, for example, Erasmus and López de Zúñiga and Carranza de Miranda were methodological and touched on the former's interpretation and translation of the Gospels. Yet, what began as a discussion of the validity of Erasmus' historical and philological approach to the study of Scripture became a heated polemic concerning issues of doctrine, which escalated in the 1520s. Accelerated by the swift dissemination of editions of Erasmus' works and fuelled by the vehement defences and attacks on the part of Erasmus and his opponents, the polemics gradually turned political. Edward Lee's failure to have his annotations printed in Spain demonstrates the tight control exerted by the Imperial court over critics of Erasmus' religious views who might, by extension attempt to undermine Charles V's plans of political and spiritual reform. Coinciding with the spread of Lutheranism in Europe, the discrepancies between Erasmus and his critics in Spain were soon subsumed into the Reformation debate and culminated in the severe examination of Erasmus' works at Valladolid. Although the polemics, which followed the inquisitorial investigation of 1527, focused on monasticism, socio-economic considerations were, in the end, also central to the discussions regarding Erasmus' religious programme.

VIVES AND THE PSEUDODIALECTICIANS

Charles Fantazzi

It has always been assumed that the *In pseudodialecticos* was Vives's first sally against the logicians of Paris. This and many other facts about his early years have been radically revised since the extraordinary discovery by Professor Enrique González of the Universidad Autónoma de México of a hitherto unknown edition of Vives's early works published in Lyons in 1514.¹ It is apparently the only extant copy of the work, Rariora Bibl. Hisp. Duod. 120, in the library of the Rijksuniversiteit Utrecht. Among the nine works in this edition is a quite remarkable composition, entitled simply *Sapiens*. The longer title informs the reader about its theme:

Ioannis Lodovici Vivis Valentini viri philosophi urbanus pariter ac gravis dialogus qui Sapiens inscribitur, in quo sapientem per omnes disciplinas disquirens professorum earum mores notat, denique veram sapientiam brevi sermone depingit (Juan Luis Vives of Valencia, philosopher, A dialogue, both witty and serious, entitled "The Wise Man," in which the author goes in search of a wise man through all the disciplines, marks the character of those who teach them, and finally describes true wisdom in a few words)

In the *praefatio* to this piece, which appears on the verso of the title page and again before the dialogue itself, the author makes it known that he wished this dialogue to be the prooemium to the whole volume (*quam proemium fore opusculi iubet*). In this preface Vives proclaims that it is the sacred duty of philosophers to censure the vices of mankind so that they will be avoided by the young. To his way of thinking satirists have been more beneficial to human existence than panegyrists. Those who keep silence about men's vices have no concern for the human race (seemingly a willed reversal of Terence's famous saying: "*Homo sum: humani nil a me alienum puto*").² With clear reference to the Parisian masters he says that those who were held up as a model and a shining

¹ Enrique González y González, *Joan Lluís Vives de la Escolástica al humanismo* (Valencia, 1987). Cf. also my "Vives's Parisian Writings," in *Humanism and Creativity in the Renaissance: Essays in Honor of Ronald G. Witt* (Leiden, 2006), pp. 245–70.

² Terence, *Heautontimoroumenos*, 77.

light have embraced lies and mad ravings and have introduced immense darkness. His counsel will not be lacking, he says, promising that he will expose their lives and make known all their foolishness to everyone in a longer discourse, nor will he desist until he is either victorious or dies in the attempt.³ Vives kept his promise five years later with the *In pseudodialecticos*.

The speakers in *Sapiens* are Vives, Nicolas Bérault, with whom he obviously had close relations while in Paris,⁴ and Gaspar Lax de Sariñena, his teacher of dialectic. The conversation gets going with Bérault making fun of Vives's quest for a wise man. He presumes that he has surely found one in those schools where the whole cycle of learning is taught and where the treasure of wisdom is concealed. Vives purposely uses the word *sophia* to allude to the sophisters and *abstrusus* to indicate their arcane teachings. All three decide to go in search of the wise man, much as Erasmus did in the *Praise of Folly*, published three years earlier. In their peregrinations they happen upon a dialectician, of course. He gives them no word of greeting but immediately begins to expound an incomprehensible sophism about two asses, two men, and three angels, with a third ass to be formed out of the two halves of the first two asses, and further pairings of this kind, which he will then proceed to prove to be both possible and impossible with respect to the logical form (as opposed to the material form) and according to the way in which the terms are accepted.⁵ This is but a foretaste of what Vives will devise with even more brio in his *In pseudodialecticos*.

The lightning bolt against the pseudodialecticians did not suddenly appear out of the blue, but was the culminating moment in a series of well publicized letters, beginning with a brief letter of Martin Dorp

³ "aperiemus omnem eorum vitam. Faciemus omnibus omnium vanitates longiore sermone perquam notas. Quin etiam non ab hoc munere minime constitui desistere quoad vel vicero vel obpetiero." *Ioannis Lodovici Vives philosophi opera* (Lyons, 1514), p. A 1.

⁴ Cf. González, *Joan Lluís Vives*, pp. 159–65.

⁵ "Sint asini duo, homines duo, et angeli tres. Ex unius asini medietate cum alterius asini medietate tertius asinus fiat. Duo angeli cum homine uno binarium unum illorum asinorum possideant, utpote primum cum tertio copulativum et copulative alteri angeli duo cum altero homine secundum binarium asinorum: tunc tibi copulativam probabo possibilem et impossibilem de forma et de forma acceptionis terminorum." *Ioannis Lodovici Vives philosophi opera*, p. D 5. Jennifer Ashworth kindly informed me that this kind of example might be found in the *Termini cum principiis necnon pluribus aliis ipsius dialectices difficultatibus* of Juan Dolz, with whom Vives probably studied for a time.

to Erasmus, which Allen dates to c. Sept. 1514.⁶ This is a rather mild, cautionary missive reporting that the *Praise of Folly* had aroused a good deal of bad feeling among the Leuven theologians and, as Dorp states, even among some of Erasmus' oldest and most faithful followers. Although Dorp himself was not unsympathetic to the new humanistic learning, he expressed his objections to Erasmus' exaggerated extolling of *bonae litterae* over all other branches of learning. He suggests that Erasmus write a corresponding *Praise of Wisdom*, which he says would bring him more popular acclaim, friendships and good repute, even some emolument. One can only imagine Erasmus' amusement at such a proposal.

Erasmus delivered a lengthy reply, which would become a defense of the *Moria*, printed together with it from 1516 on. He assures his critic that his letter gave him no offense and that he considered the advice sincere, but not without voicing the suspicion that someone else may have put him up to it. In a memorable phrase he explains that the *Folly* was concerned in a playful spirit with the same subject as the *Enchiridion*.⁷ The main target of his satire, Erasmus explains, remains the new theology with the portentous filth of its barbarous style, its ignorance of all sound language and its lack of any knowledge of the tongues. He explains indignantly: "What can Christ have in common with Aristotle? What have these quibbling sophistries to do with the mysteries of eternal wisdom? What is the purpose of these labyrinthine *quaestiones*?"⁸ It is this spreading influence of the *sophistae* on the sacred science of theology that will also incite the indignation of More and Vives. The letter ends as it began, on a friendly note, a word of thanks to Dorp for his friendly advice, which testified to his abiding affection.

Dorp gave answer a few months later, 17 August 1515.⁹ The beginning of the letter is marked by the usual politeness but then Dorp begins immediately to refute Erasmus' answer point by point in rather forthright and stinging language. He admonishes Erasmus to distinguish between a logician and a sophist, adding with bold insolence that one who knows nothing about either art cannot rightly distinguish between

⁶ Allen, Ep. 304. On the controversy between Dorp and Erasmus see also Cecilia Asso's chapter below, pp. 000.

⁷ "Nec aliud agitur in *Moria* sub specie lusus quam actum est in *Enchiridio*." Allen, Ep. 337: 91–92.

⁸ CWE 3, Ep. 337: 91–92.

⁹ Allen, Ep. 347.

the two. At the end of this tirade, Dorp assures Erasmus that he has written his letter, long and wordy as it is, in a friendly spirit and as a sincere friend.

At this point in the controversy another important figure steps in. We know that from May 12 to October 24 of 1515 Thomas More was engaged in his so-called Utopian Embassy to Flanders. During most of this period his ambassadorial duties detained him at Bruges but he also traveled to Antwerp and Mechelen to make the acquaintance of Peter Giles and Jérôme de Busleyden. It is probably from the latter, who was a friend and long-standing patron of Dorp, that he obtained copies of the correspondence between Dorp and Erasmus. More took it upon himself to reply to Dorp's criticisms in a much more elaborate and forceful manner than Erasmus had done. This document is important for understanding Vives's letter against the pseudodialecticians since it is obvious that Vives was much influenced by it. More's open letter, dated 21 October 1515, is more like a formal oration than a simple letter. Like Erasmus, he begins with his avowed sentiments of love and friendship, although he really knew Dorp only through Erasmus. After apologizing for not having had the opportunity to pay him a visit during his time in Flanders, he immediately gets down to the business at hand. He mentions that certain literary friends had informed him that Dorp seemed to be on unfriendly terms with Erasmus, as revealed in the letters, which were delivered to him on the following day. The second letter, which he says was being read everywhere, he found quite disturbing. To More's sensibility Dorp's letter contained passages that were too acerbic in tone and too slipshod in style to address to such a great man, and his chastising tone was more like that of a stern uncle or an ill-humored censor than of a friend. He quotes Dorp's rather outrageous slur directed at Erasmus: "As herons muddy the water, so those who are unskilled in the craft muddle up everything whenever they enter into the arena of debate."¹⁰ More gives strong rebuttal to these taunts and then passes to the attack, challenging Dorp's views on various educational matters, beginning with the teaching of dialectic both in Paris and Leuven. He speaks of the absurd monstrosities that are now being taught, which have befouled the pure traditions of the

¹⁰ "Aquam ardeae perturbatam esse, et imperitis item omnia perturbata, quoties in disceptandi palestram descenditur." Daniel Kinney, ed., *The Collected Works of St. Thomas More*, 15 (New Haven, 1986), p. 15, ll. 21–22.

art as handed down by Aristotle. It is this sophistic approach to the teaching of logic that will be the subject of Vives's youthful treatise directed at the Paris logicians. There are many similarities between Vives's letter and More's letter to Dorp, but Vives was much more qualified to engage in this dispute and his examples of sophisms were much more sophisticated.

After this lengthy ridicule of the language of the logicians More turns to the more serious matter of the corruption of the studies of theology by the use of this sophistic quibbling (*sophisticae nugae*). These subtle distinctions were much used in the discussions of the meaning of sacraments and sacramental rites. Like Vives in his later publication, More regrets that scholastic theologians not only squandered their youth in learning this nonsense but pursued it to their dying day. In closing More apologizes for the uncouth style of his letter, which he says he did not have time to polish and lick into shape, having been summoned by his prince to return to England. In truth, the letter does ramble on at times and in the passages of formal rebuttal, in which he quotes Dorp's very words, it is as if we were assisting at a speech in a court of law. He indulges in many asides and digressions, some of which introduce matters that are extraneous to the subject matter. Like Erasmus, More assures the Leuven theologian that his remarks are more directed at those from whom Dorp heard these charges than at him personally.

This long epistle seems to have quieted Dorp for a while. In that same month of October Dirk Martens republished at Leuven Erasmus' *Enarratio in primum psalmum* for the benefit of Leuven students. It contained Dorp's first letter, which, as we saw, was less offensive, and Erasmus' answer, allowing him the last word, as it were. Erasmus also wrote some kind words about Dorp in an introduction to the latter's oration on the Pauline Epistles, which included this extravagant praise: "I shall be most content to be put in the shade if the poor lamp of my own reputation pales before the splendour of your glory."¹¹ One must be very cautious when Erasmus makes such utterances. A few months later he candidly remarks to More: "That stupid fool X stirred up exceptional trouble for me in Leuven."¹² Both Allen and James McConica in his note in

¹¹ CWE 3, Ep. 438: 11–12.

¹² CWE 3, Ep. 474: 19–20.

CWE unhesitatingly identify “X” as Dorp. As the years progressed, however, the two men became reconciled.

With this first battle over, Vives decided to join the fray with a contribution of his own. Before discussing the influence of this piece it is necessary to clarify some matters of uncertainty about the year of publication of the *In pseudodialecticos*, which depends in turn on the dating of the *Opuscula varia*, published by Dirk Martens in Leuven. This collection contained fifteen early works of Vives, the last being *In pseudodialecticos*. It bears no date either on the title page or in the colophon but at the end of the letter Vives writes the date February 1519. In my critical edition of the work.¹³ I followed Allen’s hypothesis of 1520 as the date of publication, based on the Easter Style of dating followed by the city of Leuven. Constant Mattheeussen argued convincingly for the 1519 date.¹⁴

Mattheeussen’s arguments have now been confirmed by letters newly brought to light from the correspondence of Frans van Cranevelt, a great friend of Vives, who became Grand Councillor of Mechelen in September 1522.¹⁵ In Epistle 7 of this collection Vives writes to Cranevelt: “*Solutior iam sum aliquanto: hac enim ipsa hora et somniare desii et vigilare.*”¹⁶ (I feel somewhat more relaxed now, for at this very moment I have ceased to dream and to be awake). These cryptic words mean that he had just dispatched his *Somnium et Vigilia in Somnium Scipionis* to the publisher, Jean Thibault in Paris. As he continues, Vives says: “*Anno superiore quindecim libros simul uno partu effudi.*” (Last year I gave birth to fifteen books in one delivery). The preface of the *Somnium* addressed to Bishop Erard de la Marck is dated 28 March 1520. Thus the *Opuscula varia* must date back to the spring of 1519, not 1520.

This fact is of great importance for the dating of letters between Erasmus and Vives concerning the impact of *In pseudodialecticos* on the Parisian audience. The sequence of these letters has always been uncertain. Allen, who concluded that the tract was published in 1520, dates these three letters, 1104, 1108, and 1111, to 1520. It is now clear that

¹³ Juan Luis Vives, *In pseudodialecticos*, ed. Charles Fantazzi (Leiden, 1979).

¹⁴ Constant Mattheeussen, “De omstreden datering van een Leuvense Martens-druk: J.L. Vives Opuscula varia” in Francine De Nave, ed., *Liber amicorum Leon Voet* (Antwerp, 1985), pp. 285–301, and eadem, “The Date of the *Opuscula varia*,” in *Acta conventus Neo-Latini Sanctandreami* (Binghamton, 1986), pp. 263–268.

¹⁵ This collection was put on sale at Christie’s in London on 21 June 1989 and purchased by the King Boudewijn Foundation.

¹⁶ “Litterae ad Craneveldium Balduiniana,” *Humanistica lovaniensia* 41 (1992), 26.

all three belong to the year 1519. The first one in time is 1108: Vives writing to Erasmus, recounting a recent trip of his to Paris to see some of his friends again. It is apparent that this visit took place shortly after the publication of his tract. Apprehensive that he might encounter a cool reception from the sophisters at the University, he tells us that he avoided broaching the subject at first, but Juan Fort, to whom he had addressed the letter, was there and could not keep silence any longer. Instead of showing any hostility, Vives tells Erasmus, they all laughed and assured him that things were very different now and singled out various Spanish students who were excelling in the humanities. Before taking leave Vives gratified his audience with an improvised lecture on a dream he had about Cicero's *Somnium Scipionis*, the work he would publish the following year. It contains a humorous scene in the Palace of Sleep, which is invaded by a pack of jabbering dialecticians.

The second letter, which Allen numbers 1104, must be a first answer of Erasmus, but it is surely in the wrong numerical order. Professor González,¹⁷ rightly in my estimation, considers it a first hasty answer, which Erasmus would later elaborate for formal publication in the *Epistolae ad diversos* of 1521.¹⁸ In the first letter Erasmus congratulates his young disciple on attaining such success with the sophisters by speaking ill of them while he himself speaks kindly to them and receives nothing but hatred and ill will in return. The later letter, which Erasmus obviously intended for wider diffusion, is more of a set piece, full of bonhomie and compliments. Erasmus exclaims: "Really you have been born under some lucky star!—for a renegade like yourself to have launched a skirmish against your old companions-in-arms, the sophisters, and in Paris particularly, where, as it seemed to be the reigning queen and as it were the citadel of the subject, there was some danger that you might be pelted with stones or stung to death by hornets."¹⁹ Erasmus then takes the occasion to give a general summary of the progress of the humanities in the learned world. He expresses his kindly feelings toward Paris, of which he retains pleasant memories, where the Muses have been invited back and the logic-choppers driven out. He has heard from John Fisher, bishop of Rochester, that sophistical disputation has been replaced by sound and sober discussion between theologians, at

¹⁷ Enrique González, "Humanistas contra escolásticos. Repaso de un capítulo de la correspondencia de Vives y Erasmo," *Dianoia* 28 (1983), 152.

¹⁸ Allen, Ep. 1111.

¹⁹ CWE 7, Ep. 1111: 6–11.

Cambridge University and at Oxford, too, there has been a change for the better. Of Italy, of course, there is no need to speak, for the humanities have always been supreme there. Alcalá welcomed the study of the ancient tongues and the humanities from its inception. In Germany, he says, there are almost as many universities as there are towns, and they pay good wages to teachers of the ancient languages, save for Cologne, where power is wielded by swarms of Dominicans and Franciscans.

I have dwelt on this formal approval by Erasmus of Vives's victory over the logicians of Paris because it is a kind of official seal placed upon Vives's virtuoso performance by the Erasmus/More circle, to use Lisa Jardine's designation. In her account of the "construction of charisma in print," Jardine links up *In pseudodialecticos* with More's *Letter to Dorp*, which is certainly valid, but not to the extent that it became "part of a coordinated program orchestrated by an exemplary figure (already the 'great' Erasmus), with a precise geographical location, at a particular historical moment."²⁰ Vives was an independent thinker, very confident of himself, and in my opinion could not have been commissioned, as it were, to produce this piece, which strikes me as quite spontaneous. The commentary on Augustine's *De civitate Dei* was quite another matter. Furthermore, as a Spaniard he never was a member of the "inner circle." This is not to say that More and Erasmus did not capitalize on the talents of this young and very promising scholar.

Vives disguises *In pseudodialecticos*, an unequivocal polemic, under the form of a letter to a fellow student and roommate from his Parisian days, Juan Fort, who had studied logic under Juan Dolz de Castellar in 1511, as can be determined in references to him in various works of the Aragonese logician.²¹ He gives as his reason for writing the fact that Paris, whence the light of all learning should emanate, has become the center of a hideous barbarism, which has spawned a monstrous form of learning, to which they give the name "*sophismata*." Worst of all, the blame is laid on the Spaniards resident there. With an ingra-

²⁰ Lisa Jardine, *Erasmus, Man of Letters* (Princeton, 1993), pp. 22–23.

²¹ Vives also dedicated an edition of Hyginus' *Astronomica* to him, in which he urges him to put aside for a while the sophistries of Swineshead, a fourteenth century English logician and mathematician, and the clever points of logic of Gaspar Lax. Cf. J.L. Vives, *Early Writings* 2, eds. Jozef IJsewijn, Angela Fritsen with Charles Fantazzi (Leiden, 1991), p. 9.

tiating *captatio benevolentiae* Vives defends his fellow countrymen, whose innate talent causes them to excel in whatever branch of learning they are engaged.²² Then, coming to the real *punctum dolens*, he says that he himself has come in for criticism since he has done nothing to remedy the situation. He acknowledges that he was once one of the number of logicians and has not forgotten all those “asses” and their horrible vocabulary. This is the important difference between Vives and other humanists. He is a product of those schools and can speak their language when he wants to, but he wishes to free himself of any involvement with them. Erasmus, writing to More, had said of him: “No one is better fitted to break the serried ranks of the sophists, in whose army he has served so long.”²³ Vives himself affirms that he had no mere smattering in this madness but had acquired such an intimate knowledge of the subject that he cannot rid himself of it, and that even against his will these concepts continue to obsess his thoughts, constituting an impediment to his pursuit of more worthy subjects.

With this premise, meant not only for Fort, of course, but for the whole Parisian academic community, Vives launches into a list of extreme examples to illustrate the non-language of the logicians. The examples that he gives might be classified by the technical term *insolubilia*, but they are really meant to show how the Latin language was strained to the breaking point by the Parisian doctors. As Valla did before him, Vives asks in desperation what language it belongs to: French, Spanish, Gothic, or Vandal. At this point he enlarges on Valla’s linguistic argument in a particularly lucid manner. Logic, like grammar and rhetoric, he says, was considered a *scientia sermocinalis*, a study having to do with language, and therefore it is just as wrong to invent your own language in logic as it is in grammar or rhetoric. First there were the Latin and Greek languages and then the rules of

²² There was a flourishing group of Spaniards at the beginning of the century at the college of Montaigu, disciples of the famous Scottish philosopher, John Mair. Jerónimo Pardo had collaborated with him in an edition of Peter of Spain’s suppositions as early as 1494, and wrote a huge work himself, *Medulla dyalectices*, in 1500. Antonio Coronel of Segovia collaborated with Mair in many specialized tracts of terminist logic. Gaspar Lax of Sariñena, Vives’s teacher, was one of the greatest Spanish logicians of the time. Other famous names were Juan de Celaya, Juan Dolz de Castellar and Fernando de Enzinas. For a list of their writings see Vicente Muñoz Delgado, *Lógica Hispano-Portuguesa hasta 1600* (Salamanca, 1972), pp. 74–77.

²³ CWE 7, Ep. 1107: 14–15.

grammar, rhetoric, and dialectic were observed in them. Language was not twisted to adapt to them but rather the rules adapted themselves to the language. We do not speak Latin as we do because Latin grammar bids us so to speak; on the contrary, grammar bids us to speak in a certain way because that is the way Latin is spoken. As with grammar and rhetoric, so logic discovers truth, falsehood, and probability in the common speech that everyone uses. But since these so-called sophists do not have the natural ability and learning to prove a proposition with ordinary words, they have invented for themselves certain meanings of words contrary to all custom and conventions, so that they may seem to have won in debate when they are not understood.

Vives then gives an impressive display of his own familiarity with the theory of suppositions, which is developed at great length in Peter of Spain's *Tractatus*, or as it was often called, the *Parva logicalia*.²⁴ This is a subject of great complexity which I, as a non-logician, cannot pretend to explain, but that is not our purpose. It might be of some use, however, to define briefly the concept of supposition.²⁵ Etymologically, the medieval coinage *suppositio* means "to stand for" or be "placed for," and it is precisely the analysis of the ways in which words, occurring in a proposition, are used to stand for some thing or things and affect the meanings of other words that constitutes the late scholastic training in logic. There are many kinds of supposition and it is the distinctions among them that are crucial to the solving of some of the sophisms that Vives cites as ludicrous examples. Modern logicians recognize these experiments in the invention of terminology as a laudable achievement of the medieval logicians that parallels certain modern developments of the science. In reality, the highly systematized, if somewhat barbarous

²⁴ These last six tracts of the *Summule logicales* provided a compendious discussion of a distinctly medieval contribution to the science of logic referred to as the *logica moderna*. The main doctrine of this branch of the subject was the properties of terms (*proprietates terminorum*). Both More and Vives liked to refer to this part of the work as *parum logicalia*, i.e. "containing little logic". There is a critical edition of the work: Peter of Spain, *Tractatus, called afterwards Summule logicalia*, ed. Lambert Marie de Rijk (Assen, 1972). Peter has traditionally been identified with a Portuguese scholar who became Pope John XXI, but this identification has been seriously questioned by Angel d'Ors, a professor at the Complutensian University in Madrid, in a series of articles beginning with "Petrus Hispanus O.P. Auctor Summularum," *Vivarium* 35 (1997), 21–71.

²⁵ There is an excellent discussion of the theory of supposition in Ernest A. Moody, *Studies in Medieval Philosophy, Science and Logic* (Berkeley, 1975) pp. 371–392. See also the recent chapter by E.J. Ashworth, "Language and Logic," in *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval Philosophy*, ed. A.S. McGrade (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 73–96, esp. 90–93.

form of Latin which they devised was still inadequate for the exigencies of their science. Yet, to be fair, their attempt at devising a language for formal logic must not be altogether disparaged and despised, and Vives sometimes indulges his satiric vein to excess. Today, highly formal systems of symbols that employ one sign for one function have almost replaced natural language altogether, thus eliminating the problem of determining the functions of equiform signs in each given instance, one of the tasks attempted by the theory of supposition. The real accomplishment of late scholastic logic was to have brought to light weaknesses of the traditional Aristotelian logic in their effort to formulate some of its syntactical and semantical presuppositions.

Most of the sophisms which Vives provides as examples of the bizarre statements that were debated and expounded by the logicians are either taken directly from the classroom or are closely modeled on those actually in use, as may be verified in surviving lists of examples. From his own training in these techniques he was well qualified to parody the seemingly inane quibbling that delights in the suppression of terms and semantic ambivalence. I shall give but a sampling of them, followed by the explanations provided to me by two prominent authorities in the field of medieval logic, the late Norman Kretzmann and Paul Vincent Spade, some twenty-five years ago when I published an edition of the work:

“Anti-Christ and the Chimaera are brothers.”

“Nothing and No-man bite each other in a sack.”

“The ass of Anti-Christ is the son of the Chimaera.”

These outlandish examples are all dependent upon the fallacious use of nothing and no-one as syllogistic terms. The first example may be thus reconstructed: Anti-Christ is the brother of no-one (in that he does not exist), and no-one is the brother of the Chimaera (another non-existent figure). Hence Anti-Christ is a brother of a brother of the Chimaera, and consequently, Anti-Christ and the Chimaera are brothers. In the next example let us suppose that the sack is empty, save for Plato and Socrates, who are biting one another. Then, on the one hand, everything in the sack is biting someone, so that there is nothing in the sack that is biting no one. On the other hand, everyone in the sack is biting something, so that no one in the sack is biting nothing. Therefore, nothing is biting no one in the sack, and no one is biting nothing. The third is like the first: Nothing is the ass of Anti-Christ, but likewise, nothing is the son of the Chimaera. Hence, the same thing is both the ass of Anti-Christ and the son of the Chimaera.

Enough of that tomfoolery! Vives likes to make fun of the sophisters' use of certain expressions such as "*mente concipio*" or "*ita mihi notat*" (that is what it denotes to me) or to speak "*de rigore*" that is, in the language of logic, making rigorous application of the rules governing supposition rather than "*naturaliter*." He takes them to task for using words which they have arbitrarily invented and therefore can have no effect if no one understands them, and contrasts their methods with the example of Aristotle, who in his *Sophistical Refutations* demonstrates how to evade every sophistic trick that ever existed or might be invented in the future without having to rely on new and unusual words or altered meanings of old words. Here he has great words of praise for Aristotle, *vir ille divino ingenio, indefesso et singulari*,²⁶ whereas in later works he would be very critical of the master.

Another target of Vives's slants is the use of syncategorematic words, literally words predicated jointly, which have no meaning by themselves but only in conjunction with one or more words or concepts. William of Sherwood and Peter of Spain were the first to investigate the logico-semantic character of these words, which later became the object of subtle discussion. Exclusive words such as *tantum* (only), *solus* (alone), exceptive words such as *praeter* (except), *nisi* (unless), and modal adverbs like *necessario* (necessarily) and *contingenter* (contingently) featured prominently. Vives likes to ridicule the use of the verbs *incipit* (begins) and *desinit* (ceases) as syncategorematic words. (They occupy a whole chapter of the *Syncategoremata* attributed to Peter of Spain). Thus Vives gives the following example:

Who ever said that a boy could not begin to learn an hour after he was brought to school? Well, the logicians say he can't because many instants have passed by after that first instant in which he began to learn. Likewise they say the following statement 'This spring is now beginning to appear' is false two or three hours after the water began to flow. They do not admit these statements either: 'This tree ceases to bloom,' just before it finally stops producing flowers, or 'A spring stops flowing' about a half-hour before it dries up. In this way they have contracted the meanings of the words *incipit* and *desinit* into such narrow confines that they can no longer be used. I think that according to their rules nothing at all can be said to begin or cease to be or to act. All of this is because of that adverb *immediate*, which they have brought out of the midst of barbarity

²⁶ Vives, *In pseudodialecticos*, p. 52.

and to which they have attributed such astonishing powers that it can mean whatever they want it to mean.²⁷

Vives often injects a bit of urbane humor into his letter to break the solemnity of the discourse while at the same time reinforcing his point. To illustrate how these trained logicians can improvise anything at the spur of the moment and will fight to the death to defend their views he tells a true story about a book of syllogisms whose author Fort would immediately recognize. Vives describes how the third mood of the second figure, commonly known by the mnemonic word *festino* (literally, “I hasten”) was composed while a group of friends were drinking and singing in the baths of St. Martin on the *rive droite*. They sang all the more loudly so that the logician could produce his syllogism the more quickly (as in the *festino* figure), and so he did in his uncouth style and it was ejected prematurely, like an aborted fetus before dawn. The logician referred to must in all likelihood be Juan Dolz, who was noted for his obscure style.

Vives continues to rail against the elaborations of the supposition, namely amplification (the extension of a common term from a lesser to a greater supposition) and its opposite, restriction, which is defined as the contraction of a common term from a greater to a lesser supposition. All of these inventions were treated in the tracts of Peter of Spain’s *Parva logicalia*. Vives remarks that these rules are so complicated that there is no scholar, not even a pseudodialectician, who does not contravene them. Aristotle does not embroil and detain his pupil in these dreary and senseless quibbles. He did not consider them worth teaching since they were opposed to all common sense and habits of speech.

Vives then turns to a subject that particularly offended the sensibilities of the humanists, the transference of the caviling and barbarous language of the logicians to the realm of theology and the resulting obfuscation of the simple truths of revelation. In this he is following in the tracks of Erasmus and More, save that he gives much less attention to theological discussions than they. In the *Praise of Folly* Erasmus had made fun of the theologians’ incomprehensible disquisitions on the Trinity, debating such *quaestiones* as: “What was the exact moment of generation? Are there several filiations in Christ? Is it a possible proposition that God the Father could hate his Son? . . . Such is the erudition

²⁷ Vives, *In pseudodialecticos*, p. 60.

and complexity they all display that I fancy the apostles themselves would need the help of another Holy Spirit if they were obliged to join issue on these topics with our new breed of theologian.”²⁸ Vives asks why this tool of learning, meant to sharpen the wits of young men, is taught to old men by old men in theology. He considers the learning and imparting of this knowledge to monks, religious men, as they call themselves, to be very detrimental to their souls. There are some theologians, he says, who think that subtle expression of theological truths is not possible without the pungent seasoning and concoctions of a crude and uncouth barbarity, stuffed with the vain devices of sophistry. Vives tells a story, which to all appearances is his own invention, about one of their number who heard tell that St. Augustine was a great logician. Getting hold of one of his books, this person found to his amazement that there was no talk there about asses, or *alter alius*, nothing about instances, hypotheses, no reduplicatives, exclusives, complete and incomplete distribution, particularization, and all that arsenal of terms used in textbooks of logic. And here Vives lists a series of nonsensical statements and paradoxes about the Trinity. The conflict between the tenets of philosophy and the truths of revelation had become particularly exacerbated in the discussions of this dogma. As Erasmus in the *Folly* parodied the application of Aristotle’s four causes to the administration of baptism, so Vives derides the scholastic theologians who have scruples about the number and size of the drops of water to be employed and their complicated formulas about “the minimum which suffices though not required, or the minimum which neither suffices nor is required.”²⁹

Vives continues to hammer home his point that people have come to believe that theological matters can be defined only in this language bubbling over with barbarisms and solecisms. Anything that is written with a semblance of style, whatever its contents, is labeled grammar. Only what they do, since it is not subject to the laws of grammar and proliferates with all the impurities of language, is not grammar. On this latter point he is in complete agreement. It definitely is not grammar, he says, nor is it anything else. Scotus, Ockham, Heytesbury, Suiseth they can understand, but Cicero, Pliny, Jerome, Ambrose are *extra scholam* (outside their discipline) and therefore understood only by

²⁸ Erasmus, *The Praise of Folly*, in CWE 27, p. 127.

²⁹ Vives, *In pseudodialecticos*, p. 74.

grammarians. How is it possible, they say, that philosophy and theology can be conveyed in such a terse and elegant style not only in Latin but in any true, unadulterated language? The worst aspect of all this, Vives laments, is that they waste so much time in this training. His advice is that they devote just a few months to these pursuits, just to see how senseless they are, but not in such a way that through their indoctrination in distorted habits of speech they are prevented from reaping the advantages of better disciplines of learning. He accuses the logicians, with some justification, that they do not have any first-hand knowledge of Aristotle, not only in natural and moral philosophy, but not even in dialectic, which they attempt to teach without ever having laid eyes on it. Vives here enunciates the humanist insistence on the definition of logic as an art, which is not to be learned for its own sake, but as a support (*adminiculum*) to the other arts and as their handmaid, as it were. Vives therefore counsels that only so much knowledge of the art of dialectic should be acquired as is necessary to ensure that an insufficient knowledge of logic will not be an obstacle to proficiency in the other arts. If too much lingering over this study should not be tolerated in the good kind of dialectic, how much time should be allowed for that garrulity which is the corruptor of all the arts? He gives a mocking description of the pseudodialecticians when they have grown old. The last part owes something to Thomas More's description but Vives's picture is more entertaining and more trenchant:

When those who have dedicated their whole lives to such pursuits have grown old and have left behind them those battles waged in the protective cover of the schools and their contentious altercations, they maintain a frigid and stultified silence wherever they go. 'Rare is their speech; and great their desire to be still'.³⁰ Then they use the silence of wisdom to cloak the immense haughtiness of their ignorance. What else can they do, these poor wretches? All that scholasticism has been left behind with the schools. They have nothing else to say. Those who previously could not be outdone by magpies or women in chattering, who were louder than Stentor, the Greek herald before Troy, now rival the fish in silence and from native frogs turn into exotic fish. Those who were the loudest and most vociferous in the fervor of the schools, when brought out from under the scholastic roof into an assembly of learned men, are as stupefied as if they had been brought up in the woods.³¹

³⁰ Juvenal, *Satires*, 2.14.

³¹ Vives, *In pseudodialecticos*, pp. 82, 84.

The young Valencian humanist sees a new dawn appearing. He says he cannot be made to believe that these absurd monstrosities can last much longer. For almost five hundred years they have visited many evils on men's minds. "It is time that together with the Latin language, that is, with its seedbed, the other arts should wake from their deep sleep."³² He thinks that the day is not far off when native talents will assert themselves and human minds will issue from darkness into light, for these nebulous monstrosities are already struggling under their own weight. He hopes that within twenty years this whole edifice will crumble and be consigned to the silence of everlasting night. As for himself, he confides to Fort that he feels immense gratitude to God for having delivered him from Cimmerian darkness into the light of day and allowed him to recognize the studies that are worthy of man and for that reason are called the humanities.

Vives is aware that many will reject his words since they will be reluctant to admit to themselves that what they have struggled so long to achieve has proved in the end to be worthless, and that they have wasted the labors of so many days and so many sleepless nights. If they do not wish to believe me, he continues, let them put their faith in older men and their own teachers, who will be quick to condemn this madness and deplore the time they wasted on such empty trifles. Vives confides to his friend that he often heard Dullaert and Gaspar Lax, his former teachers, whom he names out of respect, complaining bitterly that they had spent so many years uselessly in these empty pursuits. To the end Vives keeps up his barrage against what he considers an antiquated system of education. He asks Fort whether the University of Paris does not give the appearance of a woman past her eightieth year, showing signs of advanced senility. The fact is, he says, if anyone does send his sons there, he doesn't send them to the sophisters but to those few who still retain some good sense among all those lunatics. Using a ploy that Erasmus often resorts to, Vives insists that he has mentioned no one by name, and if some readers are not convinced of his words, they are free not to forsake the embrace of their beloved asses and the delights of their dialectics. He ends with an encomium of his own nation, exhorting his fellow countrymen to exercise their

³² "Tempus est ut simul cum lingua Latina, id est, cum suo seminario, reliquae quoque artes tam diu sopitae excitentur." Vives, *In pseudodialecticos*, p. 87.

superior talents in the study of finer things so that as with their other talents, they will excel also in erudition.

Such searing and eloquent criticism must have been widely circulated in Paris and elsewhere and contributed to its gradual elimination from the schools. Signs of its demise were plainly visible. Even John Mair himself, teacher of both Dullaert and Gaspar Lax, adjusted the technical language of his textbooks to a more understandable Latin. Lefèvre d'Étaples, who taught philosophy at Cardinal Lemoine College, explained Aristotle with Aristotle, not with scholastic commentaries. He produced his own *Artificiales introductiones in logicam* (1496) in a new humanistic language denouncing the Gothic plague that had contaminated the Latin tongue.³³ As Ann Moss notes,³⁴ various revisions of this work were published regularly over the next fifty years, replacing those of Mair. In 1503 Henri Estienne published Lefèvre's complete edition of Aristotle's *Organon*, that is, the Latin version of Boethius, now revised against the Greek in a language redolent of the Latin of the humanists. In the dedication of the book to Germain de Ganay, Lefèvre invites the young to drink from the pure font of Aristotle rather than from the brackish waters of scholastic commentators.³⁵ By 1530 at the latest, the dialectic texts had dropped out and were replaced by books designed for the new humanistic curriculum with new translations of the Greek text of Aristotle, although Peter of Spain's *Summulae* continued to be used in many universities as an introduction to the subject. After a last surge in the production of the scholastic texts by professors in the school of John Mair, there was a sharp falling off after 1520.³⁶ The last printed edition of the *Libellus sophistarum ad usum oxoniensium* appeared in 1530.³⁷

³³ Eugene F. Rice, *The Prefaces of Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples* (New York, 1972), Ep. 13, pp. 38–39.

³⁴ Ann Moss, *Renaissance Truth and the Latin Language Turn* (Oxford, 2003), pp. 78–84.

³⁵ “Nunc ergo, O iuvenes, ex Aristotelico opere ceu ex proprio fonte purissimas haurite delibateque aquas. Peregrinas autem tamquam viles lacunas insalubresque Trinacriae lacus devitate.” Rice, Ep. 27, p. 87.

³⁶ Cf. Jennifer Ashworth, “Changes in Logic Textbooks from 1500–1650,” in E. Kessler, C.H. Lohr, and W. Sparr, eds., *Aristotelismus und Renaissance* (Wiesbaden, 1988), pp. 75–81. Cf. also Brigitte Moreau, *Inventaire des éditions parisiennes du seizième siècle*, 2 (Paris, 1977).

³⁷ Cf. J.M. Fletcher, “The Faculty of Arts,” in *History of the University of Oxford*, 3 (Oxford, 1984), pp. 156–99.

There is a sequel to the publishing of *In pseudodialecticos* which is of interest here. In May of 1520 Thomas More wrote a letter of extravagant praise of Vives to Erasmus.³⁸ He says that he took special pleasure in his *In pseudodialecticos* not only because Vives so cleverly made fun of their absurd arguments and confuted them with his inescapable reasoning but also because certain things were treated in the same way as he himself had done, which was good for his self-esteem. Indeed, he sees that in several instances they had used almost the same words (*propedum eadem etiam verba*),³⁹ as if their minds were joined by a kindred star. More is referring, of course, to his letter to Dorp. The similarities are indeed striking. Jardine and Guerlac take this remark as an endorsement and an advertisement, as it were, for Vives's treatise. Guerlac speaks of a "strong feeling of intellectual kinship with the younger man"⁴⁰ and Jardine considers it a printed testimonial (Erasmus published the letter in his *Epistolae ad diversos* in the following year), calculated "to build a pedigree in print citations as a substitute for diplomas and degrees."⁴¹ I disagree with this interpretation, seeing it rather as a manifestation of mild annoyance by More. At any rate, there can be no doubt that the work had a strong impact in Parisian circles and elsewhere.

Towards the end of *In pseudodialecticos* Vives expresses the hope that if by God's grace he will live another ten years in reasonably good health, he will rid people's mind from the errors purveyed by the logicians not by arguments but in reality (*ipsa re*). He did so partially at least, in *De disciplinis*, first published in 1531. This monumental work is divided into two sections, *De causis corruptarum artium*, a criticism of the current system of education, and *De tradendis disciplinis*, his suggestions for the reform of the curriculum. In Book III of *De causis* Vives discusses dialectic, which he says has accumulated much squalor and filth over the centuries (*multum contraxit squaloris ac sordium*). In the fifth chapter of this book he comes to his friends, as he calls them, the *sophistae*, in whom all the defects of this art have collected as in the bilge of a ship.⁴² He

³⁸ Allen, Ep. 1106.

³⁹ Daniel Kinney provides an appendix of these similarities at the end of his article, "More's *Letter to Dorp*: Remapping the Trivium," *Renaissance Quarterly* 34 (1981), 179–210.

⁴⁰ Rita Guerlac, *Juan Luis Vives Against the Pseudodialecticians* (Dordrecht, 1979), p. 157.

⁴¹ Lisa Jardine, *Erasmus, Man of Letters*, p. 18.

⁴² "Sed venio iam ad amicos meos recentes, ut ipsi vocant Sophistas, in quos tamquam in navis sentinam omnia huius artis vitia confluxerunt." Juan Luis Vives, *Opera omnia*, 6,

accuses them of making an assault on metaphysics, not taking from it what seemed to apply to logic, as Aristotle did, but immersing themselves and their pupils in the secrets of nature that can only be known through sense experience. These teachers immediately plunge the young boy just out of grammar school into predicables and predicaments just as the ancient Germans used to plunge their new-born sons into an icy stream. Once again Vives inveighs against their abstruse terminology and nonsensical language.

In chapter six he returns to the discussion of language that he had broached in the previous work, how Aristotle and Cicero had made use of the common language instead of devising a specialized language of their own, but he is consoled by the fact that now even schoolboys know their Latin because of the innovations in the teaching of the language. He cannot refrain, however, from ridiculing ampliations, restrictions, exponibles, exclusion, insolubles, and all the rest of that verbal paraphernalia. In chapter seven he complains that at Paris two years are spent on logic and scarcely a year on the rest of philosophy. In his view the logicians were born for debate and altercation. They never miss an opportunity for argument and contradiction. A good line from Publilius gives point to his argument: "*Nimum altercando veritas amittitur.*" (By too much disputing the truth is lost). These men play to the crowd. They take to themselves the title of "*invincibilis*" or even "*sophista horribilis*" (in the sense of "awe-inspiring"). They pretend that this training will sharpen the wits of the students, but instead it makes them grow wild, not active in the pursuit of finer things, but captious and contentious. In the last paragraph of the third book⁴³ Vives suddenly lashes out at Valla in a blanket condemnation not only of his dialectic but of his teachings on language. He says that he attempted a revision (*reconcinnatio*) of Aristotelian dialectic, but that aside from a few good points he makes many errors, being too hasty in making judgments. As for his errors in dialectic, Vives says that he will either omit them altogether or save them for another occasion since to undertake a dispute with him would require too much time and besides he is not taken too seriously. This gratuitous indictment seems disingenuous on the part of Vives. At other times he has praise for Valla as one who

ed. Gregorius Majansius (1782, repr. London, 1964), p. 110. The dislocation of various parts of the *De disciplinis* in various volumes according to subject matter is very misleading, but since this is the only edition readily available, I shall cite from it.

⁴³ Vives, *Opera omnia*, 6, p. 151.

helped revive the ancient languages. In general, there is very little that is new in this discussion of the corruption of the study of dialectic.

In a short work in *De tradendis disciplinis* in two books, the *De censura veri*, which might be translated “the assessment of the truth”, Vives fashions his own semantic analysis of language for the discovery of the truth. He states in the opening sentence: “*Instrumentum examinandae veritatis singulis disciplinarum atque artium idem accommodatur nec ullam habet certam materiam rerum in qua versetur sicut nec illud alterum de quaerenda probabilitate.*”⁴⁴ (The same tool for investigating the truth is suitable to all disciplines and arts, and it has no specific subject in which it is to be used; this is true also in seeking probability.) The practitioner of any art must find the *enunciatio*, the expression of an idea that is suitable for discerning the truth or discovering the truth through probability. In this Vives is obviously influenced by Ciceronian topics and the argumentative methods of Quintilian, which replaced the syllogism. What follows is a method of distinguishing sign from signified and a grammatical analysis of the many ways in which signifying may be accomplished. The second book deals with methods of argumentation, including the enthymeme, epicheirema (an attempted proof that is not conclusive), induction, *gradatio*, *coacervatio* (usually known by its Greek name, sorites), with examples of each. He then gives a complete description of the syllogism and the eighteen types with their individual mnemonic terms. This little treatise is a useful summation of many dialectical and also epistemological concepts.

Included in the *De tradendis disciplinis* are two other short works, the *De disputatione* and the *De instrumento probabilitatis*. The former is a rather desultory essay on argumentation, in which at one point Vives gives advice on how to argue with a “*sophista*.”⁴⁵ The second work is more substantial and, as Peter Mack remarks, it “is a thorough account of dialectical invention.”⁴⁶ Here, as elsewhere, Vives shows

⁴⁴ Vives, *Opera omnia*, 3, p. 142.

⁴⁵ Vives, *Opera omnia*, 3, pp. 68–82. This brief essay became popular as a textbook when it was added as an appendix to a compendium of the *Dialectica* of Johann Caesarius, edited by Kaspar Rudolf, a teacher of logic in Leipzig. It was printed at least 32 times between 1534 and 1574 in the cities of Leipzig, Ingolstadt, Mainz and Strasbourg. See Enrique González González and Víctor Gutiérrez, “Los impresores alemanes y la difusión de la obra de Vives en el siglo XVI,” in *Alemania y México: percepciones mutuas a través de impresos: siglos XVI–XVIII*, ed. Horst Pietschmann et al. (México, 2005), p. 179.

⁴⁶ Peter Mack, *Renaissance Argument. Valla and Agricola in the Traditions of Rhetoric and Dialectic* (Leiden, 1993), p. 319.

an indebtedness to Rodolphus Agricola's *De inventione dialectica*, which Peter Mack describes succinctly as follows: "It is about how to think about what to say; how to find convincing material, how to organize it in order to teach, move, and please an audience."⁴⁷ It is the creative part of dialectic, the art of speaking convincingly. Agricola's word is *probabiliter*, which in Latin bears the meanings of plausible, something that is capable of proof, and also something that has the appearance of truth, or probable. All of these significations of the word are operative in Vives's essay as well. It is significant that the first printed edition of Agricola's work was edited by none other than Maarten van Dorp and published by Dirk Martens in Leuven in 1515. Vives, who was in Leuven at the time, must have used this very edition. He refers often to Agricola, always with great praise, as in this commendation of the *De inventione dialectica*: "*dialecticam voluminibus tribus facundissime et ingeniosissime expositam.*" [Majansius VI, 355]. Rather than write his own manual of dialectic he may have been content with the textbook of the Frisian scholar, which was already gaining popularity, and by the end of mid-1530s had replaced for the most part Peter of Spain. As Rita Guerlac remarks,⁴⁸ using a phrase of Francis Bacon, he "cleared the ground" to prepare the way for his own grand plan of education outlined in the *De disciplinis*.

One may well wonder why the logicians did not mobilize a counter-attack. Various reasons can be given. For one thing Vives was not yet an important figure, despite the obvious efforts of Erasmus and More to promote his cause, to merit a formal response. More importantly, he did not involve himself in theological disputes or in the controversies surrounding the Vulgate. In this essay he only gives a few examples of the uses of terminist logic in theological definitions. Thomas More in his letter to Dorp had profusely elaborated on this deleterious effect of the sophistic approach in theology. Of course, his letter was much more than an attack against the logicians. It was a defense of the *Moria*, a work dedicated to him and recalling his name. In addition, Vives's works were not yet widely circulated. The *Opuscula varia*, in which the *In pseudodialecticos* first appeared, could not have attracted much attention at first. A final reason could be that the logicians did not have anyone in their ranks who could match Vives's rhetoric and they might have

⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 120.

⁴⁸ Guerlac, *Juan Luis Vives Against the Pseudodialecticians*, p. 43.

ended up making greater fools of themselves. It must be remembered, however, as James Farge has so forcefully reminded us,⁴⁹ that the Faculty of Theology, “*le parti conservateur*,” as he calls it, and to some extent the Faculty of Arts were still quite impregnable to such shafts. Vives may have been instrumental in the further introduction of new textbooks and teaching methods, but in Paris, at least, it did not result in a complete reform of the curriculum. He wrote a brilliant satire, exposing the most bizarre aspects of terminist logic, but he did not succeed in destroying its basic tenets.

⁴⁹ James Farge, *Orthodoxy and Reform in Early Reformation France: The Faculty of Theology of the University of Paris, 1500–1543* (Leiden, 1985), and idem, *Le parti conservateur au XVI^e siècle* (Paris, 1992).

THE FACULTY OF THEOLOGY AT PARIS AND THE
'THEOLOGIZING HUMANISTS'

ATTACKS ON THE BIBLICAL HUMANISM OF JACQUES LEFÈVRE D'ETAPLES

Guy Bedouelle

(trans. by Anna Machado-Matheson)

Jacques Lefèvre (c. 1460–1536), born in Etaples, Picardie, and known as Faber Stapulensis among his peers, is one of the earliest and most famous figures of French humanism. Following a general introduction to Lefèvre's life as scholar and teacher, we shall discuss the major stages in the development of his biblical humanism and the attacks they engendered on the humanist.

THE RETURN TO THE SOURCES

Though an ordained priest and a student and later a professor at the Collège du Cardinal-Lemoine in Paris, Lefèvre never acquired a doctorate in theology, a fact his adversaries did not fail to underline. Already in his earliest publications, begun in 1492, he devoted himself to the call for a return to the sources. The range of his work was comprehensive and eclectic, encompassing Greek philosophy, in particular Aristotelian philosophy, patristics, and medieval spirituality. Lefèvre's sustained interest in mysticism and contemplation provides a unifying theme, tying together these diverse strains. Upon returning from a sojourn in Italy, where he met Ermolao Barbaro, Marsilio Ficino, and Giovanni Pico della Mirandola, he became the "restorer" of Aristotle, whose teachings he elucidated for his pupils. Yet he was also interested in hermetic writings, in Hermes's *Poimen*, and in Pseudo-Dionysius. He was less attracted to the scholastic doctors of the Middle Ages, drawing more on mystics and spiritualists such as Richard of Saint Victor, Hildegard of Bingen, Ramon Lull, Ruysbroeck, and many others.

For each of these texts, published with the first Parisian printers, Josse Bade, and Henri Estienne, he supplied an introduction and offered a Latin translation to improve the *textus receptus*. He furthermore added annotations following an exegetical method, first applied to the Aristotelian corpus and later extended to biblical texts. He retained this

method until the end of his days. The labour of editing and annotating, which, as Lefèvre explicitly states, was a substitute for the monastic career his weak health prevented him from pursuing, culminated with the publication, in 1514, of an edition of the works of Nicholas of Cusa, a project he headed and which was supported by a truly international team of scholars.

Though highly theological and mystical in nature, the corpus of Cusa's writings was the last non-biblical work that Lefèvre handled. Thereafter, the humanist became an editor and commentator, a preacher, and finally a translator, of the Bible. Initially, he commented on and provided a new Latin translation of the Psalms, the only book from the Old Testament he tackled. He did the same for the entire New Testament, with the exception of the Acts of the Apostles and the Apocalypse. But from 1523 onwards, he began a French translation of the entire Vulgate Bible, the final version of which was printed in Antwerp in 1530.

It was at the Abbey of Saint-Germain-des-Prés, where he had been summoned to introduce the spirit of monastic and scholarly reform, and then at Meaux, in the circle of Bishop Guillaume Briçonnet, who sought to transform his diocese by applying a programme of humanist evangelism, that Lefèvre developed his biblical commentaries. At the end of 1525, he and some of his disciples were obliged to seek refuge in Strasbourg, where he found himself surrounded by supporters of the "new faith." He returned to France in the middle of 1526, first to Blois, then to Nérac, to the court of Marguerite de Navarre, the remarkable sister of Francis I, who continued protecting Lefèvre and his closest friends. Thus Paris, Meaux, Strasbourg, and Nérac constitute four successive stages in the erudite and pious life of Lefèvre. It is remarkable that, in each of these places, he acquired a circle of friends and disciples who provided him with aid and support.¹ He died in 1536.

Protestant historians have sought to present Lefèvre as one of the pre-reformers. Theodore Bèze included his portrait in *Icones* in 1580. In 1842, Charles-Henri Graf presented a similar view, basing his opinion on the Pauline commentaries.² This position was popular with historians

¹ Guy Bedouelle, "Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples (c. 1460–1536)," in *The Reformation Theologians, An Introduction to Theology in the Early Modern Period*, ed. Carter Lindberg (Oxford, 2002), pp. 19–33.

² Charles-Henri Graf, *Essai sur la vie et les écrits de Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples* (1842; repr. Geneva, 1970).

well into the twentieth century, although some Catholic scholars objected to it.³ The matter was, in some ways, deconfessionalized by Richard Stauffer, who recalled that in France, at the time of Lefèvre's death, one could still remain vague regarding one's religious opinions or show an open mind and that it was not yet necessary to choose sides.⁴

In fact, in the case of Lefèvre, one must clearly distinguish periods of writings. The Commentaries on the Pauline Epistles of 1512, revised in 1515, strike a tone similar to that of the reformers, and the letters of Lefèvre to Farel in 1524 and 1525 reveal an admiration for Oecolampadius and Zwingli. In Strasbourg, he met with the reformers Bucer and Capito. After 1527, however, we have no further trace of such inclinations, although his commentaries on the Catholic Epistles reveal a moderate position on the matter of faith and works. The visit that the young Calvin paid to him in Nérac is only attested in the life of the Genevan reformer written by Nicolas Colladon.⁵ It seems more likely that Lefèvre, in the last ten years of his life, held fast to a vision of humanist evangelism resembling that of his protectress Marguerite de Navarre. It was a time when, with some exceptions, the confessional frontiers were not yet well defined. Nevertheless certain Catholic theologians considered Lefèvre, especially after 1523, a dangerous mind, since he had dared to express an opinion on the sacred Scriptures without being a licensed theologian.

SCRIPTURE, TRADITION, AND TRADITIONS⁶

Lefèvre first dealt with a biblical text in his *Quincuplex Psalterium*, published in 1509. As he stated in the preface addressed to Cardinal Briçonnet the Elder, archbishop of Narbonne, it was for the monks of St. Germain-des-Prés⁷ that he presented, in parallel columns and in

³ Pierre Imbart de La Tour, *Les origines de la Réforme*, 2 (Paris, 1944), pp. 488–523.

⁴ Richard Stauffer, "Lefèvre d'Étaples, artisan ou spectateur de la Réforme?" in *Interprètes de la Bible* (Paris, 1980), pp. 11–29 (original article dated 1967).

⁵ *Opera Calvini* 21 (Braunschweig, 1879), col. 57.

⁶ *Tradition and traditions* is the title of the classic essay by Yves Congar (New York, 1967), who used the terms to distinguish divine revelation embodied in Scripture and tradition as later defined in the Council of Trent ("Tradition") from ecclesiastical and liturgical practices and customs ("traditions").

⁷ The cardinal (d. 1514), who had embarked on an ecclesiastical career after the death of his wife, was the father of his namesake (d. 1534), then bishop of Lodève and abbot of Saint-Germain-des-Prés in Paris, and later reformer of Meaux.

keeping with Origen's *Hexapla*, five versions of the Latin Psalter. One can read there the three versions successively compiled by Jerome, another which is a reconstruction of an older text, and Lefèvre's own translation reconciling the texts. He selects from the four versions the elements he deems best in each, while giving preference to Jerome's last version, which is more faithful to the Hebrew. He furthermore supplies readers with philological explanations as well as spiritual analyses, which concentrate, in the concordance of the texts, on the mystery of Christ.

This first attempt in the biblical sphere, elegantly printed by Henri Estienne, does not seem to have aroused the suspicion of theologians, although certain assertions could be interpreted as advocating the principle of *Sola Scriptura*. It is easy to overlook, in the second edition of 1513, a new sentence, which makes its appearance in the preface, reaffirming in a somewhat theoretical manner the validity of the four medieval senses of Scripture, which a purely Christological reading would seem to exclude. This is clearly a response to criticism, perhaps explicit, of having ignored the traditional hermeneutic. Attention should also be drawn in the 1513 version to a long appendix on the question of the salvific sufferings of Christ at the time of his descent into hell, an addition provided in response to a Carthusian reader whose comments Lefèvre welcomed as a correction offered in a brotherly spirit.⁸ It is no more than a theological *disputatio*, resembling those Lefèvre would encounter in the following years.

Indeed, in the years 1514–21, prior to the dissemination of Luther's writings and ideas in France, Lefèvre and his disciple Josse Clichtove, who was a doctor of the Faculty of Theology at Paris, were at the centre of controversies. The parties to those disputes, however, cannot be easily categorised, for sometimes humanists sided with theologians, other times they opposed them. On the whole, however, professional theologians were more sensitive to the Tradition or even the traditions.⁹

These polemics—serious pastimes or intellectual diversions—take place after Lefèvre's publication of his commentaries on the Pauline Epistles at the end of 1512, although they do not solely arise from that

⁸ Guy Bedouelle, *Le "Quincuplex Psalterium" de Lefèvre d'Étaples, Un guide de lecture* (Geneva, 1979), pp. 154–61.

⁹ Richard Cameron, "The Attack on the Biblical Work of Lefèvre d'Étaples, 1514–1521," *Church History* 38 (1969), 9–24.

text. There is no need here to dwell on the problems of authenticity or attribution, such as Lefèvre's inclusion of the apocryphal letters of Paul and Seneca, which were easily identified as spurious by Erasmus,¹⁰ nor do we need to concern ourselves with the Pauline authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews, which was a more delicate subject at that time. However, the doubt expressed by Lefèvre concerning the attribution of the Vulgate to Jerome soon brought him a great deal of criticism.

One notable example of this type of controversy is found in the dispute over the three Marys, initiated by an inquiry of Louise of Savoy, mother of Francis I, in connection with a pilgrimage to Sainte Baume in Provence, the supposed site of the cave to which Mary Magdalene withdrew. Legend and liturgical tradition united three figures in the Gospels (cf. John 12:1–8; John 20:11–18; Luke 7:36–50) and in this manner exalted in one person the contemplative life, the pardoned sinner, and the announcer of the resurrection of Christ. Exegesis, by contrast, distinguished three persons.¹¹

Lefèvre and Clichtove, supported by Heinrich Cornelius Agrippa, held fast to the strict reading of the Gospels or, at least, the tradition “consonant with the Gospel,” distinguishing the three women, while Marc de Grandval, Canon of Saint-Victor, John Fisher, bishop of Rochester, Noël Beda, syndic of the Faculty of Theology at Paris, and others sought to respect the mystical unification proposed in the liturgy. Erasmus maintained a prudent position, repeatedly pointing out the danger of dogmatising what the Church had not. This was essentially the position of Lefèvre as well, as he entitled his treatises *Disceptationes*, that is, discussions. He and Clichtove insisted that the question was of a historical nature. Nevertheless, all protagonists in the controversy paid attention to the theological dimension of the question.

In fact, Lefèvre, utilising a hermeneutic we shall encounter again in the debate with Erasmus on Psalm 8, considered it more dignified to leave the image of Mary, sister of Lazarus, more or less intact. As a symbol of the contemplative life, she should not be suspected of any sin, even a sin that had been pardoned. Supported in this by Clichtove,

¹⁰ Irena Backus, “Renaissance Attitudes to New Testament Apocryphal Writings: Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples and His Epigones,” *Renaissance Quarterly* 51 (1998), 1169–98.

¹¹ Anselm Hufstader, “Lefèvre d'Étaples and the Magdalen,” *Studies in the Renaissance* 16 (1969), 31–60.

he favoured an approach more sensitive to harmony and perfection, whereas the liturgy, defended by his opponents, proposes a more dramatic vision, eliciting a dialectic of conversion and grace through the figure of Mary Magdalene.¹²

In contrast, John Fisher's concern was most certainly proper respect for a tradition that had been so strongly attested by the Church for such a long time, for which the adage "*Lex orandi, lex credendi*" could be invoked. Yet throughout his argumentation, the bishop of Rochester raises the question of the clarity of Scripture: Should we not consult the Church Fathers and the theologians, renowned for interpreting biblical texts, when clarification is needed? Thus the central question is the magisterial authority of the Church, which he confirms here, even if he does not formally establish it.

At the same time, and often within the same treatises, the subject of the triple marriage of Saint Anne was raised. Lefèvre cast doubt on it out of piety and respect, yet with the ulterior motive of providing a secondary argument for the doctrine of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, a doctrine generally upheld by the French humanists. Fisher, along with the Carthusian Pierre Cousturier (Sutor) and Beda in Paris, were advocates of the legend of the three husbands of the mother of the Virgin Mary.¹³

Thus, these controversies sharply defined the position of each biblical exegete, exacerbating the situation on the eve of the greater conflict with Luther. With respect to the Magdalenes, Clichtove proposed a hermeneutic that would discern different levels of authority within Church teaching.¹⁴ Lefèvre developed what he termed a spiritual intelligence of the Scriptures, whereas the theologians concerned themselves with respect for the Tradition into which they did not hesitate to incorporate the traditions. We must now turn to a closer examination of certain criticisms of Lefèvre's Pauline commentaries.

The controversies, which were essentially scholarly discussions, turned bitter and aggressive in the Reuchlin affair. It is fitting to mention this case here, because it created an atmosphere of suspicion and ill will and to a certain extent explains the theologians' subsequent attacks on

¹² Guy Bedouelle, *Lefèvre d'Étaples et l'intelligence des Écritures* (Geneva, 1976), pp. 191–96.

¹³ Jean-Pierre Massaut, *Critique et Tradition à la veille de la Réforme en France* (Paris, 1974), pp. 75–80.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 81–96.

Lefèvre, one of Reuchlin's partisans. The affair is discussed at greater length elsewhere in this volume.¹⁵ Here, we shall only discuss the role played by the French humanist. He was familiar with Reuchlin's works and appreciative of them. He repeatedly cites, for example, the *De Verbo mirifico* in the *Quincuplex Psalterium*.¹⁶ In 1510, through the assistance of Beatus Rhenanus, Reuchlin obtained for Lefèvre manuscripts used in his edition of Nicolas of Cusa's works. In Paris, Lefèvre defended his friend at the time when a number of European universities were consulted on certain propositions in Reuchlin's books that had been attacked by the Cologne theologians.

Reuchlin had sent Lefèvre his *Defense against the Slanderers of Cologne*, so that he could make use of it in the Parisian discussions. In addition, he sent various documents to the Faculty of Theology at Paris for their information.¹⁷ On August 2, 1514, the Faculty condemned as "false and foolhardy" the assertions made by Reuchlin.¹⁸ In a letter dated August 30, 1514, Lefèvre informed Reuchlin of the unhappy news.¹⁹ He commented that some of the theologians, who, in his view, were of sounder judgement, had defended him with courage (*viriliter*). He named among them Geoffroy Boussard, Guillaume Petit, the Dominican confessor to the king of France, who had not hesitated to refute his colleagues from Cologne, Guillaume Chastel and Martial Masurier. The four men were close to him at the time and through them he may have been able to exert some influence on the proceedings of the Faculty of Theology. To comfort his friend, Lefèvre pointed out to him that the verdict was purely "scholastic" and did not decide the outcome of a matter that should be appealed and settled in Rome. "If you are victorious there, so shall we be victorious with you," he declared, demonstrating complete solidarity with Reuchlin regarding the use of Hebrew texts in the interpretation of Christian Scripture.

A doctrinal commission did, in fact, gather in Rome in 1516. Reuchlin's supporters were in the majority. At the request of Marco

¹⁵ See Daniel Menager's chapter above, pp. 39–54.

¹⁶ Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples, *Quincuplex Psalterium* (Paris, 1509), fol. 105r.

¹⁷ A.L. Herminjard, *Correspondance des Réformateurs de langue française*, 1 (Paris, 1866), Ep. 2, pp. 9–15, and Matthias d'Asta and Gerald Dörner, eds., *Johannes Reuchlin Briefwechsel*, 2 (Stuttgart, 2003), pp. 415–10. This letter dated August 31, 1513 announces the publication of the *Defensio contra calumniatores suos Colonienses*.

¹⁸ Augustin Renaudet, *Préréforme et humanisme à Paris pendant les premières guerres d'Italie (1494–1517)*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1955), p. 649.

¹⁹ Herminjard, *Correspondance*, Ep. 3, pp. 15–18.

Vigerio, cardinal-bishop of Sinigallia, one of Lefèvre's letters was read in the assembly, quite possibly the letter cited above. It was intended to counter the "Parisian sentiment" maintained by the Faculty of Theology. At the reading, a doctor from the Sorbonne (a "Franciscan *fraterculus*") exclaimed that Lefèvre was not a Paris theologian. In response, one Brother Giles (doubtless a Roman Carmelite), cried out: "Well spoken, he is not a member of that group of theologians; he is above your group!"²⁰

The commission rendered a judgement favourable to Reuchlin on July 2, 1516, which was, however, not the final verdict in the case.²¹ As early as July 11 Aegidius of Viterbo, general of the Augustinians, famous for the discourse on reform he delivered to the council of Lateran V in May of 1512, wrote to Lefèvre, rejoicing about this victory.²² He, too, recalled the public reading of Lefèvre's letter before the assembly of prelates and theologians in Rome, which was "warmly applauded" and which "served as a shield and a torch" in defence of Reuchlin. In the fulsome style of humanist epistolography, Aegidius added a compliment which is not without relevance to the debates surrounding biblical humanism: "You have done everything," he said, "after the example of our Jerome, preferring truth over falsehood and being more willing to find repose in the light which comes from adversaries than the darkness we find among friends."²³ It is possible that this sentence, which must obviously be understood within the context of the Reuchlin affair, applies more to the man who wrote it, whom we might classify among the Christian cabalists of the Renaissance, than to Lefèvre himself.²⁴ It expresses the humanistic ideal, which does not hesitate to seek the light wherever it can be found, even beyond Christianity, for a better understanding of Scripture.

²⁰ Joseph Schlecht, ed., *Briefmappe II* (Münster, 1922), pp. 79–80. The text consists of a written account of the sessions held by the Commission that was made for Reuchlin by his prosecutor in Rome, Martin Gröning.

²¹ See above, pp. 45–46, note 26.

²² Guy Bedouelle and Franco Giaccone, "Une lettre de Gilles de Viterbe (1469–1532) à Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples (c. 1460–1532) au sujet de l'affaire Reuchlin," *Bibliothèque d'humanisme et Renaissance* 36 (1974), 335–45.

²³ Bedouelle and Giaccone, "Une lettre," p. 358.

²⁴ François Secret, *Les kabbalistes chrétiens de la Renaissance* (Paris, 1964), pp. 114–15; John O'Malley, *Giles of Viterbo on Church and Reform* (Leiden, 1965), p. 98.

There is no doubt that Lefèvre's known commitment to Reuchlin was the cause of the first difficulties the French humanist encountered with the theologians. After May 2, 1515, the Faculty of Theology of Paris wished to discuss with him, in an "amicable manner" (*amicabiliter*), certain passages from his works, which had been cited by Reuchlin's defenders.²⁵

It is true that certain decisions in the Pauline commentaries of 1512 had raised eyebrows. The first audacity committed by Lefèvre was his offering of a new Latin translation of the Vulgate, presented, admittedly, in smaller characters beside the traditional text. He justified this initiative by demonstrating how certain expressions in the Vulgate were faulty but, so as not to lay the responsibility on Jerome, he preferred not to attribute the authorship of this Latin version to the saint. He explained this in the *apologia*, which followed the dedicatory letter to Guillaume Briçonnet, bishop of Lodève. Lefèvre's argument was essentially based on a comparison between the text of the *vetus interpretatio*, as he called the *textus receptus*, and the biblical commentaries of Jerome, which cited a different translation of the Pauline epistles.

At the end of 1514, George Cavis, a canon of Tournai sympathetic to Lefèvre, wrote to his former school-fellow in Paris, Josse Clichtove, requesting clarification on four of Lefèvre's modifications to the commonly used translation.²⁶ Interestingly, he expressed a desire to respond to the objections of malevolent critics. Clichtove responded in great detail in February 1515, in a text which has now been edited and analysed.²⁷ The Parisian disciple of Lefèvre highlights certain common-sense rules: first, one must always check the accuracy of a text, since it may contain errors introduced by a copyist or even the translator; next, one must distinguish between the inspired text and its commentaries, even if these commentaries were issued by saints and doctors. After all, did not Jerome and Augustine engage in exegetical disputes?

The four objections (which Clichtove terms *calumniae*) centre first on the translation of Romans 1:4, then on that of 1 Corinthians 9:5 and Philippians 4:3, where Lefèvre asserted that Paul had been married, and finally on 1 Corinthians 15:51 concerning the resurrection of the

²⁵ Renaudet, *Préréforme*, p. 654; A. Clerval, *Registre des Procès-Verbaux de la Faculté de théologie de Paris*, 1 (Paris, 1917), p. 178.

²⁶ James K. Farge, *Biographical Register of Paris Doctors of Theology, 1500–1536* (Toronto, 1970), p. 87.

²⁷ Massaut, *Critique et Tradition*, pp. 47–59, 123–57.

dead.²⁸ On the first point, Clichtove shows that Lefèvre is closer to the Greek. With respect to the marriage or celibacy of the apostle Paul, he discusses the text, but judges that the matter does not in any way touch on an article of faith. Lastly, he offers a sufficiently broad interpretation of the text on the resurrection of the dead, which upholds the translation provided by Lefèvre.²⁹ It is important to understand here that, for the most part, it is not Lefèvre's commentaries that are in question but his translations, although these translations clearly imply a certain interpretation. Theologians such as Civis or Clichtove made an effort to explain the reasons, whether philological or relating to tradition, which led Lefèvre to deviate from the accepted text. In the same vein the Franciscan Marco Vigerio, Cardinal of Sinigallia, who, as we have read, was sympathetic towards Lefèvre at the time of the Reuchlin affair, took up the defence of the Pauline commentaries.³⁰ Yet it was this work that led to a dispute between Lefèvre and Erasmus.

THE QUARREL WITH ERASMUS

The conflict between the two humanists has been studied at length. It will suffice here to recall the theological issues whose importance transcended the simple question of translation.³¹ The dispute concerns verse 6 of Psalm 8, cited in the Epistle to the Hebrews (2:7), and the question: Should we read, according to tradition, "You made him a little lower than the angels" (*paulo minus ab angelis*), or rather "a little lower than God" (*paulo minus a Deo*)?

Lefèvre had clearly opted for the latter reading in the first edition of his *Quincuplex Psalterium* in 1509, republished in 1513, but he expanded on it in 1512, in his Pauline commentaries, when annotating Hebrews 2. Erasmus seized the opportunity to criticize Lefèvre's position in his *Novum Instrumentum* of 1516. The latter responded with a *Collorarium* to

²⁸ Erasmus' translation follows that of Lefèvre. He even relies on his example in the controversy on this topic which set him against the Carmelite Egmondanus (Nicolaus Baechem) and the theologians of Leuven LB I, col. 899 F.

²⁹ Massaut, *Critique et Tradition*, pp. 56–58, 150–57.

³⁰ LB IX, col. 60 C; CEBR 3, p. 392 and Renaudet, *Préréforme*, pp. 654–55.

³¹ For example, Margaret Mann Phillips, *Erasmus et les débuts de la Réforme française, 1517–1636* (Paris, 1934), pp. 16–46; Helmut Feld, "Der humanistische Streit um Hebräer 2:7 (Psalm 8:6)," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 61 (1970), 5–33; John B. Payne, "Erasmus and Lefèvre d'Étaples, as Interpreters of Paul," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 65 (1974), 54–83. See also CWE 83.

the notes on Hebrews 2 in the second edition of his Pauline commentaries, dated 1515, no doubt in error rather than on purpose, for the text was clearly written in 1516. There, the humanist takes Erasmus to task and goes so far as to assert that any interpretation of Psalm 8 different from the one he himself proposes is "heretical and most unworthy of Christ and God... contrary to the spirit and adhering to the letter which destroys."³² In this manner, the condemnation of a literal reading of the Scripture, expressed in the preface to the *Quincuplex Psalterium*, was taken up once again, but in much more severe terms.

Erasmus declared that he had come upon this remark of Lefèvre's by chance in July of 1517. He called it a "*disputatio*." Feeling under attack and roused by indignation, he wrote a refutation within two weeks and had it published at the end of August by Dirk Martens in Leuven. It was the *Apology against Jacques Lefèvre d'Etapes*, which created a lasting antagonism between the two great humanists. To the great disappointment of Erasmus, Lefèvre never responded, instead maintaining a hurt silence. Doubtless, the two men could have come to an explanation in person in May of 1526, when Lefèvre, leaving Strasbourg, stopped in Basel and met Erasmus. But we have no written trace of Lefèvre's reaction to the *Apology*, which had treated him roughly. It is true that, nearly ten years afterwards, the religious scene in Europe had changed significantly and that disputes among humanists were then becoming few and far between, seeming at that time more like academic contests among erudites.

Nevertheless, in the *Apology*, Erasmus puts his finger on certain weaknesses in Lefèvre's christological interpretation and in so doing proves to be a better theologian than his friend. In fact, Erasmus takes the position and demonstrates that, in this specific case, there is no room for an exegetical dispute. He emphasizes that all the Church Fathers adopted the reading "*ab angelis*," except for Jerome, although even he did not exclude it. Above all, Erasmus considered Lefèvre's reasons for clinging to the "*a Deo*" reading to be ill advised.

Since Psalm 8 obviously refers to Christ, as Hebrews 2 states explicitly, Lefèvre deemed it more correct to say that Christ was made through the incarnation "a little less than God," relating the text to the hymn

³² Jacques Lefèvre d'Etapes, *Commentarii in S. Pauli epistolas* (Paris, 1515), fol. 226v. Despite the refutations made by Erasmus, this intransigent declaration is also preserved in the 1531 Cologne edition, see fol. pp. iii–v.

in the Epistle to the Philippians (2:6–11). But is there really a difference between this reading and the reading “a little lower than the angels”? It is the mystery of *kenosis*, of the humbling of Christ, that is implied here. What is more, Erasmus asks, do we not say with the Psalmist (Psalm 22:7) that he is “a worm and no man”? Yet Lefèvre was reluctant to apply this verse to Christ. In each case, Lefèvre prefers the version which, to him, seems to pay more respect to the divine nature of Christ. Yet Erasmus believes that it is precisely the humanity of Christ, his weaknesses and his sufferings, the veritable instrument of redemption, that is implied here. In his intense concern for preserving the divine nature of Christ, Lefèvre risks sidestepping the very mystery of Christ being humbled. Erasmus shows well that in the Gospel the most “sublime” is not the most “divine.” In other words, one sees how Erasmus detects in Lefèvre an attitude more akin to that of Dionysius the Areopagite than to that of Augustine, more concerned with harmony and propriety than with the drama of redemption. Thus, according to Erasmus, if both readings of the verse in Psalm 8 are possible, it makes no sense radically to exclude, as Lefèvre does, the wording that seems both philologically and theologically the best. Erasmus is likewise more sensitive than his friend to the different nuances of interpretation in the scriptural text.

But Erasmus, in the heat of controversy, does not stop at that point in the *Apology*. He reproaches Lefèvre in detailed and precise, but also blunt, terms for certain errors in translation and, above all, for a general lack of critical sense that is manifested in his attribution of the Epistle to the Hebrews to Saint Paul. Regarding this last point, Erasmus makes no more than a simple historical observation, pointing out that there was, at the very least, a certain doubt about the attribution, which had been voiced over a long time. Would it not be advisable to acknowledge this, he asked. Thus Erasmus accuses Lefèvre of being, at one and the same time, both too unconditional on subjects left open to discussion, and not critical or certain enough in his “scientific choices,” as we would term them today. “In every area of discussion there has always been room for disagreement, at least in matters which have no proper bearing on articles of faith,” Erasmus declared.³³

³³ CWE 83, p. 7.

THE FRONTAL ATTACKS OF THE THEOLOGIANS

In 1519, Diego López de Zúñiga (Jacobus Lopis Stunica) published his *Annotationes contra Jacobum Fabrum Stapulensem*, in Alcalá, at the house of Arnaldo Guillermo de Brocar.³⁴ This was a serious matter, considering the geographical origin of the attack as well as the person of the attacker. López de Zúñiga belonged to the highly qualified team of scholars appointed by Cardinal Cisneros to produce a polyglot Bible in the new University of Alcalá de Henares. López de Zúñiga also attacked Erasmus. Unlike Lefèvre, however, Erasmus was not in the habit of allowing accusations to pass without response, thus igniting a quarrel that lasted until 1524.

With respect to Lefèvre, López de Zúñiga essentially took issue with the famous hypothesis claiming that Jerome was not the author of the Vulgate version used by the Latin Church. His *Antapologia* (answering Lefèvre's *Apologia*) is effectively a eulogy of the Vulgate and purposely misconstrues his adversary's arguments, making them appear feeble. For López de Zúñiga, Jerome gives the force of thunder to Paul's words.³⁵ Lefèvre, he argues, shows presumption in undertaking a new translation, although his philosophical competence and personal humility is not in question.³⁶ In fact, the Spanish theologian and philologist uses quite restrained language when he concludes in his letter to the reader that there are in the new translation "numerous errors, some rather serious."³⁷ It is for this reason that he devotes himself, epistle after epistle, chapter after chapter, to a systematic examination of the text. López de Zúñiga first cites the Vulgate, the Greek, Lefèvre's translation and finally explains his own position.

Seven years later, Beda's attack against Lefèvre and Erasmus strikes an entirely different tone. In order to fully understand the attack on Lefèvre, one must first examine the history of the long conflict, which set the Faculty of Theology at Paris in opposition to the humanist. The political dimensions are as important as the theological aspects in this

³⁴ For López de Zúñiga see also Alejandro Coroleu's chapter above, pp. 73–92.

³⁵ Cameron, "The Attack," p. 13.

³⁶ Erika Rummel, *The Humanist-Scholastic Debate in the Renaissance and Reformation* (Cambridge, Mass., 1995), p. 100.

³⁷ D.L. Zúñiga, *Annotationes contra Iacobum Fabrum Stapulensem* (Alcalá, 1519) fol. aa i v.

case. Lefèvre was protected by Briçonnet and by the sister of Francis I; he went to Meaux and sought refuge in Strasbourg.

Lefèvre had published his commentaries on the Four Gospels in Meaux in June 1522.³⁸ On June 6, 1523, the Faculty, while also debating the works of Luther and Berquin, reviewed the preaching of Martial Masurier and of Pierre Caroli, both in Meaux, and, after June 16, examined the writings of Lefèvre on the Gospels.³⁹ Two days later, Chancellor du Prat summoned Philippe Hodouart, a senior member of the Faculty, informing him that the king did not wish Lefèvre's work to be examined unless a debate could be arranged. In response, the Faculty decided on July 19 not to deal with Lefèvre personally, but to have a committee of doctors examine the commentaries on the Gospels.⁴⁰

Meanwhile, the Faculty had addressed a letter to the Parlement of Paris in order to halt the public sale, already well underway, of the commentaries until the Faculty had finished its examination of the text.⁴¹ The king then remanded the case to the Great Council for review; that is, he advised Parlement on July 11 that he would be judging the matter himself. The Faculty discussed contacting the sovereign to remind him that it should be able to act in defence of the faith, but ultimately did not take any action. The king and his council declared Lefèvre innocent and prohibited the Faculty from making further attacks on him.

The Faculty of Theology thus had to submit and could only hope to take its revenge by examining vernacular translations of the Bible, regarding which the king had requested the Faculty's opinion.⁴² In the meantime, the examination of Lefèvre's commentaries on the Gospels had been completed, and the Faculty had gathered the passages perceived to be contentious. Of these passages, only eleven are known to us.⁴³

³⁸ Regarding the place of printing, see Jeanne Veyrin-Forrier, "Simon de Colines, imprimeur de Lefèvre d'Etaples," in *Jacques Lefèvre d'Etaples, Actes du colloque d'Etaples 1992* (Paris, 1995), pp. 97–117 (100–102).

³⁹ Clerval, *Registre*, pp. 354, 356.

⁴⁰ Clerval, *Registre*, p. 359.

⁴¹ See the text in James K. Farge, *Le Parti conservateur au XVI^e siècle. Université et Parlement de Paris à l'époque de la Renaissance et de la Réforme* (Paris, 1992), pp. 53–55, and his essay on Bédouin in this volume below, pp. 143–64.

⁴² Clerval, *Registre*, p. 377 (August 11, 1523).

⁴³ Charles Du Plessis d'Argentré, *Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus*, 2 (Paris, 1728), xi, and C.E. Du Boulay, *Historia universitatis parisiensis*, 6 (Paris, 1673), p. 183. These were reproduced by Richard M. Cameron, "The Charges of Lutheranism brought

The censured passages, removed from their context, could be interpreted as advocating a *Sola Scriptura* approach to the faith, as suggesting a far too trenchant opposition between the Old and the New Testament, as insisting upon the spiritual presence of Christ in the Eucharist at the expense of a sacramental presence, and finally as objecting to the invocation of the saints. Although there was no further examination of these texts, they eventually served Noël Beda as ammunition in his attacks against biblical humanism.

The absence of King Francis I and his subsequent captivity in Spain in the first months of 1525 allowed the Faculty, and especially Beda (occupying the position of syndic since 1520) to resume their offensive against Erasmus and Lefèvre. The Homilies on the Gospels and Epistles written in Meaux were censured at that time. This was also the period when Lefèvre sought refuge in Strasbourg and thus supplied his adversaries with a reason to label him a "Lutheran."

At this point, then, Beda prepared a digest of his criticism of the biblical works of Erasmus and Lefèvre. The first part of his work, the section concerning Lefèvre, was approved in manuscript by the Faculty on February 15, 1526,⁴⁴ and the complete version, which included an attack on Erasmus, on May 16.⁴⁵ Already on February 5, the Parliament of Paris had declared itself opposed to the writings of Lefèvre and any translation of the Scriptures into the vernacular.⁴⁶

Beda's digest was entitled *Annotationum... in Jacobum Fabrum Stapulensem libri duo et in Desiderium Erasmus liber unus* and was printed by Josse Bade. The first book discusses Lefèvre's Commentaries on the Pauline Epistles, the second the Commentaries on the Gospels, and the third the *Paraphrases* of Erasmus. On June 16, the Dutch humanist complained to the king, obtaining the withdrawal of Beda's book from circulation, but half the stock had already been sold by Josse Bade.⁴⁷ In March 1527, the king wrote to the Faculty to express his concern regarding the attacks against Lefèvre, Roussel, and Caroli.⁴⁸ Nevertheless another

against Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples (1520–1529)," *Harvard Theological Review* 63 (1970), 119–49 (131–132).

⁴⁴ James K. Farge, ed., *Registre des Procès-Verbaux de la Faculté de théologie de l'université de Paris (1524–1533)* (Paris, 1990), p. 124.

⁴⁵ Farge, *Registre*, p. 137.

⁴⁶ Farge, *Registre*, p. 126, note 10.

⁴⁷ Farge, *Registre*, p. 143; and CEBR 1, p. 117.

⁴⁸ James K. Farge, *Orthodoxy and Reform in Early Reformation France* (Leiden, 1985), p. 193.

edition of the digest was published in Cologne at the house of Petrus Quentel. Indeed, Beda was not a man to be discouraged. He published another book with Josse Bade: *Apologia...adversus clandestinos Lutheranos*, printed at the beginning of February 1529, after being approved by the Faculty on December 15, 1528.⁴⁹ In this last work, Lefèvre is cited, but it is mainly directed against Erasmus and the members of the group from Meaux. In fact, Beda repeatedly conflated the humanists with the German reformers, enumerating in one list Reuchlin, Lefèvre, Erasmus, Luther, Melanchthon, Oecolampadius, and “men of this ilk.”⁵⁰

The criticism directed towards the “theologizing humanists” (*humanistae theologizantes*) is expressed right on the first page of Beda’s preface to the *Annotationum...libri*. There was, within the Church, a faction of men who, educated solely in the humanities and languages, dared to tackle divine matters, he wrote. Concerning these theologizing humanists, one could even say that they taught Lutheran doctrine better than Luther himself.⁵¹ One might call them “Fabricians” rather than Lutherans.⁵²

Building on the earlier criticisms of López de Zúñiga and Cousinier,⁵³ Beda listed his remarks and accusations as he progresses through Lefèvre’s New Testament, not without first refuting the prefaces to the volumes. It is not possible to detail here the objections which the syndic of the Faculty presented in great detail.⁵⁴ The main criticism concerned biblical interpretation and the fact that Lefèvre had abandoned the traditional four senses, focusing instead on a single and unilateral sense. Reinforcing his reproach, Beda included a similar criticism made by Erasmus regarding his friend. Fundamentally, Beda believed that Lefèvre’s error lay in his refusal to admit that “it is the Church which understands and interprets Scripture.”⁵⁵

Beda thus compared the errors made by Lefèvre to those of infamous heretics, condemning him along with writers from Antiquity as well as more recent figures like Wycliff or Marsilius of Padua.⁵⁶ He saw

⁴⁹ Farge, *Registre*, p. 205.

⁵⁰ N. Beda, *Annotationum...in Jacobum Fabrum Stapulensem libri duo et in Desiderium Erasmus liber unus* (Paris, 1526) fol. 146r.

⁵¹ Ibid., fol. aa v.

⁵² Ibid., fol. 133v.

⁵³ Ibid., fol. iiiii r.

⁵⁴ Richard Cameron has analysed some of Beda’s theological critiques, comparing these to the specific texts by Lefèvre that they address, see Cameron, “The Charges of Lutheranism,” pp. 137–46.

⁵⁵ *Annotationum...libri*, fol. 106r.

⁵⁶ Ibid., fol. aa2 v.

no contradiction, moreover, in accusing Lefèvre successively of being Lutheran and Pelagian. Beda made numerous accusations based on inferred conclusions drawn from isolated passages in Lefèvre's works. Others arose from associating the humanist with other members of the group from Meaux, whom the syndic had come to know in recent years through the censures of the Faculty of Theology. In keeping with an attitude he maintained throughout his career, Lefèvre did not respond to the allegations made by his accuser.⁵⁷

THE TRANSLATIONS OF THE BIBLE

In his 1525 treatise on the translation of the Bible, *De tralatione Bibliae et novarum reprobatione interpretatione lucubrationes...*, the Carthusian Pierre Cousturier (Sutor), a doctor of Theology,⁵⁸ devised new titles for Lefèvre: "a sciolist, a manikin, a philosophaster, a translationist."⁵⁹ Thus, to be a translator had now become an insult.

Obviously, one must distinguish between the problem of vernacular translations and the new Latin translations, which Cousturier effectively targets when he opposes the endeavours of Lefèvre and Erasmus. The latter knew how to defend himself; Lefèvre, as usual, remained silent but defiant. Cousturier's polemic was primarily a defense of the Vulgate, much like the one López de Zúñiga had presented in 1519. Cousturier used the recurring argument, also familiar from Beda, of the theological incompetence of humanists: "If someone is a believer it does not immediately follow that he is a theologian."⁶⁰ Indeed, a translator must be a saint like Jerome, and especially inspired.⁶¹ The Vulgate, accepted by the Church, tried and true, used over the course of centuries, did not require recourse to the ancient languages, of whatever other interest their study might be.

Cousturier raised another argument, which was not without pertinence, when he evoked fears regarding the substitution of the new

⁵⁷ Beda considered the silence maintained by Lefèvre to be preferable to the quibbles of Erasmus, who, in his responses, added "error onto error." Pierre Caron, *Noël Beda* (Paris, 2005), p. 180.

⁵⁸ Farge, *Biographical Register*, pp. 119–21.

⁵⁹ Translation from Rummel, *The Humanist-Scholastic Debate*, pp. 5–6. See also eadem, *Erasmus and His Catholic Critics* (Nieuwkoop, 1989), esp. 2:61–72.

⁶⁰ Rummel, *The Humanist-Scholastic Debate*, pp. 90, 100.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 105.

humanist Latin translations in the Ciceronian style for the rough but simple style of the Vulgate: "The Holy Spirit has dictated the Bible in a humble style so that Holy Writ may benefit not only Latin scholars but also common clerics who generally know little Latin."⁶²

Concerning the biblical translations into vernacular language, Cousturier considered it sufficient that the people could recite the Lord's Prayer, the Decalogue, the Creed and the Commandments of the Church. One must not trouble them by revealing that not all the ecclesiastical prescriptions are contained within the Scripture.⁶³

Obviously, the humanists held an entirely different position. But, unlike Erasmus, for whom there was no doubt that vernacular translations should be made available, but who did not undertake the work himself, Lefèvre tackled the task. He published his New Testament in sections (the Gospels, the Epistles, the Acts of the Apostles and, lastly, the Apocalypse) between June and November of 1523. In his prefaces to the individual volumes, he justified his labour by stressing the necessity for all to understand the text of the salvific Word. At the same time he deemed it necessary to translate from the Vulgate so as not to deviate too far from the text known and used hitherto by the clergy.

It was under these circumstances that the Faculty of Theology took up the debate, and opinions were by no means unanimous. Their intense discussion continued through the entire month of August. They conducted a campaign of censorship, but no decree was published, no doubt in order to avoid displeasing the king. In the course of the proceedings, the Latin translations of Erasmus and Lefèvre were condemned.⁶⁴ Clichtove, who was a friend and a supporter of Lefèvre, sought to introduce subtle variations into the evaluation of these translations.⁶⁵ Two years later, when Pierre Gringore's translation of the *Heures de Notre-Dame* was published, the Faculty of Theology declared on August 26, 1525 that such translations were neither necessary nor indeed useful and were therefore prohibited. Two days later, the Parlement of Paris demanded that all these translations, along with "any printed books containing passages of the Gospels or epistles read on Sunday or on feast days

⁶² Ibid., p. 122.

⁶³ P. Cousturier, *De translatione Bibliae* (Paris, 1525), fol. xciv; Cameron, "The Charges of Lutheranism," pp. 129–30.

⁶⁴ A. Clerval, *Registre des Procès-Verbaux*, p. 380 (22 August 1523).

⁶⁵ Ibid., p. 378 (17 August 1523); see also Farge, *Orthodoxy and Reform*, pp. 177–79.

during the year, together with certain exhortations in French, should be relinquished and turned in within eight days.”⁶⁶

The proceedings of 1523 do not seem to have affected the Parisian printers of Lefèvre's French New Testament. After 1525, however, publication was carried out covertly or distributed from Antwerp and Basel.⁶⁷

THE HOMILIES ON THE EPISTLES AND THE GOSPELS

On November 6, 1525, the Faculty of Theology of Paris condemned forty-eight propositions taken from a work referred to as *Epistolae et Evangelia ad usum Diocesis Meldensis*, adding that the work had been written in French. The decree likens this censured work to the heresies of the Manicheans, of the Vaudois, of the Wycliffites and of the Lutherans. The central criticism was formulated thus: “This book claims that one should only preach according to the Gospel, but the book itself does not contain anything consonant with the Gospel and indeed contradicts it.”⁶⁸

Although the pagination indicated in the censures does not correspond to any copies of the work extant today, there is no doubt that the text at issue is the *Epistres et Evangiles pour les cinquante et deux semaines de l'an*, printed by Simon Du Bois in Paris, circa 1525–1526, then in Alençon in 1530. A new edition, with additions that bear a distinctly evangelical tone, was printed by Pierre de Vingle under a slightly different title and was undertaken again by Etienne Dolet in Lyon in 1542, and afterwards by others.

The first three editions mention neither place nor date of issue but the internal criteria, mainly a comparison with the corpus of Lefèvre's biblical commentaries, make the origin obvious. The Parisian censors were not mistaken in attributing it to the circle of scholarly preachers

⁶⁶ Francis M. Higman, *Censorship and the Sorbonne* (Geneva, 1979), pp. 77–80 (citation p. 80).

⁶⁷ Eugene F. Rice, Jr., ed., *The Prefatory Epistles of Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples and Related Texts* (New York, 1972), pp. 563–65, and Francis M. Higman, *Piety and the People, Religious Printing in French, 1511–1551* (Ipswich, 1996), pp. 271–73.

⁶⁸ Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples and his disciples, *Epistres et Evangiles pour les cinquante et deux dimanches de l'an*, ed. Guy Bedouelle and Franco Giacone (Leiden, 1976), p. liv (this edition is cited above).

Guillaume Briçonnet, bishop of Meaux, had gathered around him.⁶⁹ Considering the evidence of other testimony as well, one might conclude that these homilies, more truly models than sermons actually delivered, were the work of Lefèvre's disciples, and that Lefèvre himself might have subscribed to their theology.

This text is written in a style beautiful in its simplicity and stands in sharp contrast to the turgid sermons most prized at that time, like those of the Franciscan Michel Menot. The sermons proceed with great discretion. The censors tirelessly extracted what they considered to be heresies from assertions which, according to them, were very clear, although their criticism rested mainly on the absence of words, which they deemed significant in certain contexts. For example, one scarcely finds any patristic references in the *Epistres et Evangiles*, and the text does not contain any of the *exempla* which continued to delight the preachers of that period.

The censors reveal, in their assessment of this text, the extent to which they were sensitized to Lutheran doctrine, which was beginning to spread into France. Upon close examination of the censured passages, one can see the obsessions of the Sorbonne theologians as clearly as the evangelical convictions expressed in the texts of the Meaux preachers.

The theologians are troubled by every statement that contains the adjective "single" or "only." Thus, they assert that statements such as "All is given to us and forgiven in Jesus Christ alone, if we have faith in him,"⁷⁰ or "All peoples and nations believing in Jesus Christ will see it and will be saved"⁷¹ suggest a rejection of free will and of works.

The idea that a sermon should be deeply rooted "only in the Word of God and Jesus Christ"⁷² strikes them as a negation of Tradition and of Church teaching. Likewise, the examiners saw a negation of the cult of the Virgin and the saints in a text from Meaux, which comments on Acts 7:54–60, saying that Stephen "did not call upon the angels nor Moses nor Abraham, Isaac and Jacob nor any of the Prophets, but on Jesus Christ alone, and thereby teaches us that it is God and Our Lord

⁶⁹ Michel Veissière, *L'évêque Guillaume Briçonnet (1470–1534)* (Provins, 1993), pp. 307–13.

⁷⁰ Lefèvre d'Étaples, *Epistres et Evangiles*, p. 2 (homily 1 A).

⁷¹ Ibid., p. 96 (homily 17 B).

⁷² Ibid., p. 14 (homily 3 A).

Jesus Christ that we must invoke and not an angel or any creature.”⁷³ This accusation was used repeatedly.⁷⁴ The theologians observed that the homilies contrast sole faith in God with “elements of the world,” resulting in the denial of the works and merits of the Christian. Thus they censured propositions such as: “Our justice should not come from us, nor from our works, but from God and through him and through his spirit.”⁷⁵ It was at this time that Erasmus and Luther were engaging in a polemic over free will. Thus that question was most often raised, for example with regards to the sentence “the spirit of God alone can do all and does all within us,” which seemed to contradict the concept of free will.⁷⁶

In this censure, the Sorbonne went beyond what was accepted in medieval theology and taught regarding the connection between the three theological virtues: faith, hope, and charity.⁷⁷ The Faculty cast doubt on the Trinitarian theology (in fact impeccable) developed in the homilies apropos the explanation of John 14:28. They accused the authors of reviving the old heresy of Arius by means of a pernicious translation into the popular tongue.⁷⁸ One can see from these reproaches against the text the strong, negative attitude and prolonged opposition of the Parisian theologians to translations into the vernacular.

It should be noted, however, that not a single censure concerned the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist, for, in fact, nothing in the Epistles and the Gospels could be subjected to criticism in this point, even though the homilies seemed destined to find their way into the celebration of the Mass. In comparison with the writings of Protestant reformers, the 1525 version of the *Epistres et Evangiles* is among the most temperate of works, containing no polemical statements or formal negations of Catholic doctrine. The same does not apply to the edition revised after 1530 and published by Pierre de Vingle, a version much closer in tone to the new faith.⁷⁹

⁷³ Ibid., p. 32 (homily 6 A).

⁷⁴ Ibid., pp. 37, 221, 232.

⁷⁵ Ibid., p. 258 (homily 45 B). See also pp. 57, 63 and 285.

⁷⁶ Ibid., p. 172 (homily 30 A).

⁷⁷ Ibid., p. 113 (homily 20 A).

⁷⁸ Ibid., p. 212 (homily 37 B).

⁷⁹ Hence the added statement that is clearly Lutheran: “All that which is not done in faith is sin” (Lefèvre d’Etaples, *Epistres et Evangiles*, p. 90, homily 16 B).

THE CASE OF CLICHTOVE

From 1494, when one of Clichtove's poems appeared in an edition of Aristotle, until 1519, when he defended his master's interpretation of the three Marys, his name was continually associated with that of Lefèvre d'Etaples. During this time, Clichtove (1472–1543), who received his doctorate in Theology from Paris in 1506 and who was, in his time, one of the most illustrious members of the Faculty,⁸⁰ composed numerous commentaries on Lefèvre's editions of Aristotle. In addition, he contributed to Lefèvre's patristic publications,⁸¹ so that one may truly speak of a close collaboration, initiated at the Collège du Cardinal-Lemoine. From 1520–1521 on, however, that is, from the moment that the writings and ideas of Luther were diffused and Lefèvre, along with other pupils or disciples, repaired to Meaux at the request of Bishop Briçonnet, and up until their deaths, the two men's ideas diverged. This rupture has been variously interpreted by historians.

What is certain is that the supporters of "evangelism" considered the breach an act of desertion or even treason. Jean Lange, writing from Meaux to Guillaume Farel on January 1, 1524, recalled the "cesspool of the sewers," as he called the Faculty of Theology. He associated it with the name of Clichtove, whom he describes as senile and wasting away in this den of theologians.⁸² On July 6 of the same year, again from Meaux, in a letter to Farel, Gérard Roussel, who had shortly before published a translation of Aristotle's *Moralia* together with Clichtove's commentaries,⁸³ deplored the fact that the latter, "once one of us," continued to protect Pharisaism and had gone on to publish works against Luther, works essentially composed of bits taken from the writings of others and stitched together.⁸⁴

Roussel is referring here to Clichtove's *Antilutherus*, approved by the Faculty on May 28, 1524 before being published by Simon de Colines. It was soon followed by the *Propugnaculum Ecclesiae adversus Lutheranos*, the content of which was accepted by the Faculty on November 3, 1525 and published the following year. The register of the deliberations held

⁸⁰ Farge, *Biographical Register*, pp. 90–104 and CEBR 1, pp. 317–20 (Jean-Pierre Massaut).

⁸¹ Eugene F. Rice, "The Humanist Idea of Christian Antiquity. Lefèvre d'Etaples and His Circle," *Studies in the Renaissance* 9 (1962), pp. 126–60.

⁸² Herminjard, *Correspondance*, 1, p. 180.

⁸³ Farge, *Biographical Register*, p. 102.

⁸⁴ Herminjard, *Correspondance*, 1, p. 238.

on December 15, 1526 furthermore shows that Clichtove was part of the delegation of Faculty members to Chancellor Du Prat, requesting that the errors of Berquin, Erasmus, and Roussel, as well as those of Lefèvre d'Étaples, be addressed.⁸⁵

Whether one stresses the breach between the two men⁸⁶ or emphasizes the consistency of Clichtove's positions,⁸⁷ it must still be acknowledged that, from 1523 on, Clichtove refuted Capito with regard to the veneration of the saints,⁸⁸ then Luther and Oecolampadius with regard to the Eucharist.⁸⁹ In the *Antilutherus* as well as in the *Propugnaculum*, Clichtove defends the Tradition and the traditions of the Roman Church, in particular the practice of ecclesiastical celibacy and of monastic vows.⁹⁰ Yet, in typically humanistic fashion, he could not refrain from manifesting a certain nostalgia for the time of the primitive Church.⁹¹

In the *Antilutherus*, Clichtove sharply criticises Erasmus for questioning the authenticity of certain writings preserved under the name of Dionysius the Areopagite, and further implicitly refutes his position on fasting and, above all, his opinions on monastic vows. In the *Propugnaculum*, after discussing Luther's errors concerning Mass, the Paris doctor openly criticizes Erasmus' *Encomium matrimonii*, the translation (or rather adaptation) of which was censored by his Faculty of Theology. Erasmus responded rapidly and succinctly before taking the matter up again in 1532.⁹² Clichtove stressed the risks to the faithful if they were able to access translations of the Bible: would they not be inclined to limit themselves to the literal sense?⁹³ He presented a defence of the Catholic faith in his *Compendium veritatum*, dated 1529, and above all in

⁸⁵ James K. Farge, ed., *Registre des Procès-Verbaux de la Faculté de théologie de l'université de Paris (1524–1533)* (Paris, 1990), p. 161.

⁸⁶ J.-A. Clerval, *De Judoci Clichtovei Neoportuensis vita et operibus* (Paris, 1894), pp. 98–104.

⁸⁷ Jean-Pierre Massaut, *Josse Clichtove, l'humanisme et la réforme du clergé* (Paris, 1990) emphasized Clichtove's constancy. See his critique of Clerval, *ibid.*, 1, pp. 14–15.

⁸⁸ Nevertheless, in 1517 and later in 1519, Capito published Clichtove's *Elucidatorium*, along with laudatory prefaces, at the house of Froben, an act which proves well the humanistic reputation of the Parisian theologian, Erika Rummel, ed., *The Correspondence of Wolfgang Capito*, 1 (Toronto, 2005), Epp. 7 and 31a (pp. 10–13, 58–60).

⁸⁹ According to Clichtove, the Eucharistic doctrine of transubstantiation, promulgated at the Fourth Lateran Council, had been accepted since the early stages of the Church. See *De sacramento Ecclesiae* (Paris, 1526), fol. 73v.

⁹⁰ He believes that the religious vows are justified within the testimony of the Old as well as the New Testament, *Antilutherus* (Paris, 1524), fol. 115r.

⁹¹ Massaut, *Josse Clichtove*, 2, p. 392.

⁹² CWE 63, pp. xlii–l.

⁹³ Josse Clichtove, *Propugnaculum Ecclesiae adversus lutheranos* (Cologne, 1526), p. 105.

his *Improbatio articulorum M. Lutheri*, dated 1533. There he felt obliged, furthermore, to correct the refutations of the humanist Joris van Halewijn, which he described as awkward and ignorant.

THE INDEX OF PROHIBITED BOOKS

Like the works of Erasmus, the commentaries and biblical translations of Lefèvre were included in the various indices of books prohibited by the Roman Church, when such lists began to be compiled by the regulatory bodies. The Commentaries on the Epistles, as well as the commentaries on the so-called Catholic Epistles and the *Epistres et Evangiles*, were listed in the first Index issued by the University of Paris in 1544. The treatise on the three Marys, published in 1519, was not officially censored except in the Spanish Index of 1551 and the Index issued in Rome in 1559. The *Quincuplex Psalterium* was prohibited later, appearing in the Roman Index of 1559 and in the Spanish Index of 1583. The Latin and French translations were also condemned.⁹⁴

The works of Lefèvre were prohibited in Rome as of 1559, listed in the first official Index of Paul IV, which was notorious for its severity. For this reason, some fathers at the third session of the Council of Trent sought to form a committee for the purpose of revising the index. The majority suggested greater moderation. The committee was appointed on February 17, 1562. The Portuguese Dominican Francisco Foreiro, who had just been put in charge of the Index of Lisbon and who afterwards played an important role in the development of the Tridentine Catechism, was eventually chosen to preside over the committee.⁹⁵ It was Foreiro who was entrusted with the responsibility of studying the works of Lefèvre.

Upon the closing of the council, the committee's conclusions were promulgated and published by the pope in 1564; a special congregation would later be charged with keeping the text up to date. The biblical works of Lefèvre d'Étaples were included in the Index up until the nineteenth century.⁹⁶ Although Protestant historiography has depicted

⁹⁴ J.M. de Bujanda, ed., *Thesaurus de la littérature interdite au XVI^e siècle*, X (Sherbrooke, 1996), pp. 251, 748.

⁹⁵ J.M. de Bujanda, ed., *Index de Rome, 1557, 1559, 1564*, 8 (Sherbrooke, 1990), p. 77.

⁹⁶ One still finds his name accompanied by some works in the Index of 1881, though he is no longer included in that of 1901.

Lefèvre as one of the forerunners to the Reformation, it has also highlighted his diffidence. For this reason, his contribution to biblical humanism has long been underestimated, a victim of the attacks which the humanist decided to ignore, perhaps as a point of honour, and no doubt in consequence of his defeat in the quarrel with Erasmus.

NOËL BEDA AND THE DEFENSE OF THE TRADITION¹

James K. Farge

Noël Beda—theologian, university administrator, and polemicist—was born c. 1470, probably in Picardy (northern France).² After studying at the University of Paris for about twenty years, he received a doctorate in theology on 17 April 1508. Four years prior to that he had become the principal of the Collège de Montaigu, one of the largest and most important of the twenty-five active colleges in the university. He gave up that position in 1514, but continued to live at the college as its *éminence grise*. After becoming more active in the deliberations of the university's Faculty of Theology, he was elected in 1520 as its syndic, or executive officer. From that platform he became the leader of a "conservative party" in Paris,³ mobilizing the university, the Parlement of Paris (the supreme court of law in France), and other influential persons against humanism and the Lutheran Reformation—two movements which Beda considered to be working hand-in-hand. In turn, the humanists and Lutheran reformers held Beda in contempt and used every means possible to discredit him intellectually and to render him politically impotent. Beda's efforts were not without success, but this came at great cost: the criticism and satire of humanists such as Erasmus of Rotterdam and François Rabelais,⁴ as well as Beda's own stolid intransigence, ultimately led to his public disgrace, exile, and imprisonment at Mont-Saint-Michel, where he died in January 1537.

Beda was thus a major figure in the era of cultural unrest and movement for change that we call the Renaissance and Reformation

¹ I have previously published a short notice on Beda in my *Biographical Register of Paris Doctors of Theology (1500–1536)* (Toronto, 1980), pp. 31–36, no. 34. He figures prominently in my *Orthodoxy and Reform: The Faculty of Theology in Early Reformation France, 1500–1543* (Leiden, 1985) and in my edition, *Registre des procès-verbaux de la Faculté de théologie de l'Université de Paris, de janvier 1524 à novembre 1533* (Paris, 1990).

² Several authors place his birth at Mont-Saint-Michel on the Normandy coast.

³ James K. Farge, *Le parti conservateur au XVI^e siècle. Université et Parlement de Paris à l'époque de la Renaissance et de la Réforme* (Paris, 1992).

⁴ For example, in *Pantagruel* Rabelais made Beda the author of *De optimate triparum* (*On the Excellence of Tripe*).

in France. During the following centuries, however, he was largely forgotten.⁵ He came once again into notice—or notoriety—in the late nineteenth century with the dissertation on him by Pierre Caron.⁶ Swallowing whole the invective of Beda's enemies, Caron sets the tone of his thesis with this passage from a nineteenth-century historian of literature:

Beda tried singlehandedly to stem the surging tide of new ideas. Faced with a world that was avid to find light, liberty, and action, he appointed himself as the official spokesman and biased defender of darkness, intolerance, and stagnation.... He is a puzzling subject for study, with his hard-headed pedantry, bound to the desiccated scholastic mold, closed to every idea of progress, however harmless, the relentless enemy of good style, of vigorous spirit, and of freedom of conscience.... A true maniac for persecution, capable of setting fire to all of France, to his king, and even to himself in order to safeguard orthodoxy, he spent his life in denunciation and invective....⁷

Caron relied mostly on seventeenth- and eighteenth-century printed records⁸ and did not have at his disposal editions of archival materials that appeared later and that could have provided some balance to his presentation. He leaves historians with a Noël Beda who, although perhaps sincere in his convictions, is an ignorant, tormented man whom no sensible person could support. That caricature of Beda has held sway amidst the strong upsurge of interest, in the twentieth century, in Erasmus and other humanist authors whom Beda opposed.

The formidable exception to that approach has been the magisterial thesis that Walter F. Bense devoted to Beda seventy years later.⁹

⁵ But he figures frequently in César-Egasse DuBoulay, *Historia universitatis parisiensis*, 6 (Paris, 1665–73, repr. Frankfurt-am-Main, 1966), pp. 115–240; and documents that he edited appear in Charles Duplessis d'Argentré, *Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus qui ab initio duodecimi saeculi... usque ad annum 1632 in ecclesia proscripti sunt et notati...* (Paris, 1728–36, repr. Brussels, 1963).

⁶ “Noël Bédà, principal du Collège de Montaigu, syndic de la Faculté de théologie de Paris” (dissertation, Ecole nationale des chartes, Paris, 1898). It has recently been printed for the first time, with an introduction by Arnaud Laimé, “Le Diabolique docteur et les saints érudits” (Paris, 2005).

⁷ Charles Félix Leniant, *La satire en France; ou, La littérature militante au XVI^e siècle*, 1 (Paris, 1882), p. 259. The translation is mine.

⁸ Du Boulay, *Historia universitatis Parisiensis*, and d'Argentré, *Collectio judiciorum*: see above, n. 5.

⁹ “Noël Beda and the Humanist Reformation at Paris, 1504–1534” (unpublished, Harvard University, 1968). It was prepared under the direction of the late Heiko Oberman. I have frequently consulted this magisterial work in the preparation of this chapter. A short, earlier balanced view of Beda was in Pierre-Yves Féret, *La Faculté de*

Bense made no attempt to defend Beda's positions, many of which—it will become quite evident—are clearly untenable today. But his Noël Beda emerges as an intelligent person who defended order, discipline, and the traditions of the Church: a man of moral courage, following his conscience in and out of season, who enjoyed the support of many influential persons. Bense wrote: "From a generation that ought to have learned to appreciate the value of intelligent opposition and 'resistance' to political absolutism and the exaggerated claims of new ideologies...Beda may perhaps hope for a revision of the judgment passed on him by his enemies."¹⁰ Regrettably, Walter Bense's early death and the sheer size of his thesis (900 pages) have precluded its publication,¹¹ and few historians have profited from it.¹²

Noël Beda's career cannot be understood apart from that of his mentor, the Flemish theologian Jan Standonck (c. 1453–1504),¹³ who had saved the Collège de Montaigu from dissolution and turned it into one of the leading colleges in Paris. Standonck hoped to use Montaigu to form intelligent priests in the ascetic tradition of the *Devotio Moderna*—priests who would be agents of true and proper reform in the Church. Although his regime for the "Community of Poor Students" at Montaigu¹⁴ was strict, even harsh, Standonck provided an education for hundreds of students who could not otherwise have attended university. In the public forum, Standonck was fearless in promoting traditional faith and morals. When he dared to denounce King Louis XII for setting aside his wife to marry another, the king sent him into exile.

Like Standonck, Noël Beda fashioned his career chiefly inside the university but also took an unflinching stand in public affairs. After

théologie de Paris et ses docteurs les plus célèbres. Époque moderne, 2 (Paris, 1900–10), pp. 4–17. Férret concludes: "Beda was most zealous for the Catholic faith, but his zeal sometimes lacked moderation."

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. xvi.

¹¹ Bense published a short abstract of his thesis in *Harvard Theological Review*, 60 (1967): 485–86, and a short article, "Noël Beda's View of the Reformation," *Occasional Papers of the American Society for Reformation Research* 1 (December, 1977), 93–107.

¹² A significant exception is Erika Rummel, *Erasmus and His Catholic Critics*, 2 (Nieuwkoop, 1989), pp. 29–59. See also Mark Crane, "Competing Visions of Christian Reform: Noël Bédà and Erasmus," *Erasmus of Rotterdam Society Yearbook* 25 (2005), pp. 39–57—an article I discovered only after writing this chapter.

¹³ See Augustin Renaudet, "Jean Standonck, un réformateur catholique avant la Réforme," *Humanisme et Renaissance* 30 (1958), 114–61, originally published in *Bulletin de la Société de l'histoire du protestantisme français* 57 (1908), 1–81. On Standonck's influence see also Paolo Sartori's chapter below, pp. 215–224.

¹⁴ Marcel Godet, *La Congrégation de Montaigu (1490–1580)* (Paris, 1912).

succeeding Standonck as principal of Montaigu, Beda softened its discipline and attracted significant financial support for the college. Under his management Montaigu could boast some of the most successful teachers in the university, and many of its graduates became prominent members of the Paris Faculty of Theology and of the French clergy.

An early hint of Beda's mind-set was shown while still a candidate for the theology doctorate. In his Sorbonic disputation Beda criticized the holding of more than one Church benefice, and asserted that authority in the Church is licit only if the one holding it is motivated by love of God and his people. This principle was consonant with the *Devotio Moderna*, with Standonck's ideals for reform, and indeed with the reformist ideals of John Wyclif. However, since canon law had no provision to justify Beda's proposition, the Faculty of Theology ruled it imprudent and indiscreet, and demanded retraction.¹⁵ Beda was in no position to disobey the Faculty; but in his concern for pastoral care, or *cura animarum*, he had shown himself to be a reforming critic of abuses in the Church. Indeed, conscious that his life's work would be in institutions and not in the care of souls, he never once sought an ecclesiastical benefice, even though colleagues in positions similar to those he held vied for more lucrative preferment on an annual basis.

Historians whose predilection for humanism or for the Protestant Reformation have thus been mistaken to relegate Noël Beda to the status of a "reactionary" opposed to any change or reform in the university or in the Church. Beda was himself the product of a reformation of the University of Paris. New, reforming statutes had been imposed in 1452, and Beda's mentor Standonck had worked with other reformers to rouse the University of Paris from a lackluster period of decline that had prevailed during, and in the wake of, the Hundred Years War. They worked with the Parlement of Paris and certain bishops to build an intellectual and institutional infrastructure that would promote and sustain a reformed Gallican church. In the most important study that has been devoted to their efforts, Augustin Renaudet reached a conclusion that has been overlooked: "In this intellectual revival everybody took part, scholastics and humanists alike."¹⁶ Noël Beda was a scholastic trying to do his part in promoting appropriate reform.

¹⁵ Bense, "Noël Beda," pp. 104–05, citing J.-A. Clerval, ed., *Registre des procès-verbaux de la Faculté de théologie de Paris, I (1505–1523)* (Paris, 1917), pp. 15–18.

¹⁶ *Préréforme et humanisme à Paris pendant les premières guerres d'Italie (1494–1517)*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1953), p. 697.

A basic element in Beda's understanding of religion and the Church was the promise of Jesus to his apostles that God's Spirit would be an active, indwelling presence in the Church and the world.¹⁷ For Beda this implied a close connection between history and salvation—a continuity of dogma, moral teaching, liturgical rites, and popular devotions as expressions of religious reality that must be professed, defended, and passed on from one generation to the next. It was in the name of that living tradition that Beda fought his battles against humanism and the Lutheran Reformation.

This is neither to imply that humanists shunned the concept of tradition nor to judge that Beda's understanding of it was more authentic than theirs.¹⁸ However, since many of the beliefs and practices questioned by the humanists were deeply ingrained in the faith and devotion of most Catholics, who felt bound in conscience to defend them, one cannot dismiss out-of-hand the alarm of theologians such as Beda at what they perceived as threats to the faith and to the Church.

Indeed, Martin Luther and reformers more radical than he appeared on the Parisian scene almost simultaneously with Lefèvre d'Étaples, Erasmus, and other humanists. Both movements regarded much of Catholic practice, from pious devotions to scholastic theology, as human accretions hindering rather than helping the faith of the believer. For Luther (and to a lesser extent humanists such as Erasmus) God's Spirit worked most directly and fruitfully in an individual reading the Bible. Historical development of belief and ritual in the post-apostolic age—an integral part of Catholicism for Beda—were of little or no consequence for them. Beda therefore felt constrained to oppose both the Reformation and humanism.

Particularly abhorrent to Beda was the humanists' practice of submitting the Bible text to philological probing and of substituting the Fathers of the Church for scholastic doctors. Although their accusation that the scholastics in general neglected the Bible had some validity,¹⁹ the study

¹⁷ John 14:26.

¹⁸ See Jean-Pierre Massaut, *Critique et tradition à la veille de la réforme en France* (Paris, 1974).

¹⁹ See, for example, John Mair (Major), *In secundum sententiarum*, 2nd ed. (Paris: Josse Bade for Jean Petit, 1528), who wrote in a dedicatory epistle to Beda that many theologians had neglected the Scriptures. But now, he says, God has used "a great army of pestilential heretics" to convince theologians "to get to work on Sacred Scripture and its explanations, and to put aside their other interests." Cited by Walter Ong, *Ramus: Method and the Decay of Dialogue* (Cambridge, Mass., 1958, repr. 2005), p. 144.

of the Bible was nevertheless a constitutive part of their theological training, and they never discounted its definitive authority. In fact, it was precisely because scholastic theologians considered divine revelation to be fixed and closed that they objected to the humanists' proposals to change the Vulgate text. The humanists insisted that they were merely restoring the original, authentic text; but the scholastics regarded such changes as dangerous and blasphemous. God's Spirit, present in history as he promised, would not have so abandoned his people as to allow his very revelation to them to be corrupted. Indeed, instead of correcting the Bible, emending it for philological reasons would cause prolific textual corruption; and translating it into vernacular languages would lead to conflicting interpretations, from which schisms and sects would arise in the Church.

For their part, critics of scholasticism did not appreciate that the scholastic method had made significant advances in knowledge by applying rational investigation to many branches of human life and truth. The scholastics, on the other hand, believed that their systematic method of resolving questions according to the dialectical method was unquestionably more thorough and more certain than the topical approaches, however elegant, of the Fathers and their modern, humanist champions.²⁰ Beda held that abandoning scholasticism would impoverish the Church. Fidelity to it and to tradition in its widest sense allowed all Christians, even those with a minimum of education or culture, to inherit a faith that was integral, communal, sure, and—above all—salvific.

Beda's resignation as principal of Montaigu coincided with the University of Paris' examination of the works of the German humanist Johann Reuchlin. Its conclusion that Reuchlin's books posed dangers for the faith of Christians²¹ was a watershed event and cannot have failed to influence Beda's seeking a wider arena in which to challenge the emerging humanist movement.

²⁰ In 1530 Beda complained to the Faculty that many students were prone to abandon speculative theology in favor of "positive" theology. The statutes, he reminded them, required that speculative theology should be the basis of at least two of their academic disputations, Farge, ed., *Registre des procès-verbaux*, pp. 235–36, no. 294g.

²¹ See Renaudet, *Préréforme et humanisme*, pp. 640–55 and passim. For deliberations of the university's theologians see Clerval, ed., *Registre des procès-verbaux*, pp. 152, 155–56, 157–59, 161–62 (1, 16, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23 May, 15 July 1514), p. 178 (27 April, 2 May 1515), p. 209 (3 October 1516).

The two books that Beda had written while still principal were somewhat lightweight and even derivative.²² In 1519, however, he took on a leading French humanist, Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples, who had denied that the Vulgate Bible was the work of Saint Jerome and who advocated emending its text.²³ Lefèvre also held that persons reading Saint Paul must let God speak directly to them, not through the teaching Church, and he did not refrain from adding that many of the traditional commentaries on Saint Paul's Epistles were "briars and thistles."²⁴ In quick succession Beda published three books criticizing these and other specific exegetical conclusions of Lefèvre and his disciple Josse Clichtove. His *Scholastic Explanation of the Single Magdalene*²⁵ defended the established interpretation that the three Marys—the public sinner who anointed Jesus' feet (Luke 7:46), the sister of Martha and Lazarus at Bethany (Luke 10:39), and the woman who was the first to see Jesus after his resurrection (John 20:10–18)—were one single person known and venerated as Mary Magdalene. When Clichtove contended that this was not a matter of faith but only of human history, Beda answered that a living faith is intimately bound up with the history of the Church. His argument, however, has wider significance than the mere defense of this single point of devotion. If the humanists were allowed to dispute this point, they could go on to question many others. By writing in this book that "God wills that the faculties and prelates make provision without delay that this foyer of scandals spread no further,"²⁶ Beda declared war on the type of reform advocated by humanists.

²² The first, *La doctrine et instruction nécessaire aux chrestiens et chrestiennes* (Paris, c. 1509), was a simple exposition of basic Christian dogma. The second, *La petite dyablerie dont Lucifer est le chef et les membres sont tous les joueurs iniques et pecheurs reprouvez intitulé L'église des mauvais* (Paris, [c. 1511]) was mostly a reworking of a sermon of Saint Bernardino of Siena against gambling.

²³ Lefèvre was of course partly right. Modern biblical scholars attribute only parts of the Vulgate Bible in use in the sixteenth century to Saint Jerome, and even some of those parts had undergone textual corruption in the course of manuscript transmission.

²⁴ Bense, "Noël Beda," p. 146.

²⁵ *Scholastica declaratio sententiae et ritus ecclesiae de unica Magdalena... contra magistrorum Jacobi Fabri et Judoci Clichtovei contheologi scripta* (Paris, 1519). "Erasmus' English patron" Bishop John Fisher argued that Lefèvre's interpretation contradicted the great western doctors of the Church. It would cause countless authors, books, and sermons to be recalled and corrected, and the faithful would lose confidence in Church authority. On Lefèvre and Clichtove see also Guy Bedouelle's essay above, pp. 117–42.

²⁶ Cited in Victor Carrière, "Libre examen et tradition chez les exégètes de la pré-réforme (1517–1521)," *Revue de l'histoire de l'Église de France* 30 (1944), 52.

He wrote two more books in the same vein in 1520. His *Apology for the Daughters and Grandchildren of Saint Anne*²⁷ defended a centuries-old interpretation of the texts holding that the mother of the Virgin Mary had married three times and had at least three daughters. In his *Restitution of the Blessing of the Easter Candle*,²⁸ Beda defended the text of the Easter vigil “Exultet” canticle which proclaims that Adam’s sin was not only necessary but was also a *felix culpa*, or “happy fault,” since it led to the Son of God taking human flesh to redeem humankind.

In that same year Beda took a momentous step to implement the war he had declared against humanists and reformers in the train of Martin Luther. He convinced the Faculty of Theology to revive the lapsed office of syndic, or executive officer, in order to expedite long-standing matters on the Faculty agenda. Elected to that office, one of his first actions was to bring closure to the Faculty’s nine-month-long deliberations on the Leipzig debate between Johann Maier of Eck and Martin Luther²⁹—a delay that Beda rightly saw as helpful to Luther alone. Reelected three times as syndic, Beda was for fourteen years the *de facto* leader of the most powerful academic institution in northern Europe. He presided over dozens of important deliberations and decisions about religious reformers and humanist teachings, using as his guide the concept of tradition and defending its time-honored manifestations in the Church. In the limited parameters of this chapter, however, we can deal only with a few of these.

A salient example arose in 1522. Jacques Merlin,³⁰ a colleague of Beda on the Faculty of Theology, translated some writings of Origen, the third-century Greek theologian and exegete. Merlin’s book included an *apologia* exonerating Origen from the charge of heresy decreed by the Second Council of Constantinople (A.D. 553). Originally published in 1512, it was reprinted in 1517 and 1519 with no particular notice. Its third reprinting in 1522, however, roused a Flemish former student of Jan Standonck named Christiaan Maseeuw to compose “Dialogues”

²⁷ *Apologia pro filiabus et nepotibus beatae Annae* (Paris: Josse Bade, February 1520).

²⁸ *Restitutio in integrum benedictionis caerei paschalis* (Paris: Josse Bade, August 1520).

²⁹ Eck and Luther had both asked that the whole University of Paris, as well as that of Erfurt, be consulted. Erfurt declined to rule on this; and Duke George of Saxony chose to consult only the Paris Faculty of Theology rather than the whole university. The result was the *Determinatio theologicae facultatis parisiensis super doctrina lutheriana* (Paris [Antoine Bonnemère, 1521]), reprinted in d’Argentré, *Collectio judiciorum* 1, pt. 2, pp. 365–74.

³⁰ See my notice on Merlin in *Biographical Register* (see n. 1), pp. 325–31, no. 343.

critical of Merlin's *apologia*. Beda wrote a preface for Maseeuw's book which charged that Merlin's rejection of a dogmatic teaching that had prevailed in the Church for nearly a thousand years would encourage heretics and humanists to contest still other decisions of the Church. The Faculty of Theology at first remained neutral in the matter, although it refused Merlin's request to forbid the printing of Maseeuw's book.³¹ Merlin appealed to the Parlement of Paris, which became more directly concerned when, in editing a collection of conciliar decrees, he emended a text on the heterodoxy of Origen.³² The case dragged on until January 1527, when the Parlement obliged Merlin to compose a new *apologia* that the Faculty of Theology could accept.³³

At one stage in the foregoing case, Merlin insisted that Beda recuse himself (i.e. withdraw for reasons of bias) from the Faculty's examination. This spurred Beda to set out his views about the rights and duties of qualified theologians to pass judgment on matters of Church doctrine.³⁴ Relying heavily on Jean Gerson (1363–1429), one of his favorite authorities, Beda affirms that every certified theologian, because of his long studies and because of the authority vested in him by the Apostolic See when granting his degree, is *ex officio* a judge of doctrine. He concludes that, because the scope of the theologian is directed at truth, not at persons, no theologian can be excluded from deliberations in a matter of faith, since the truth will deliver even a heretic from error.³⁵ Drafting this statement obviously helped Beda clarify his belief that

³¹ Jean de Gourmont began to print them, but the court suit prevented his publishing them. On 25 October 1525 Anglebert de Marnef requested a copyright from the Parlement of Paris to print Maseeuw's *Dialogues* "that uphold the opinions of St. Jerome and Pope Gelasius about the works of Origen, together with certain additions made by master Noël Beda..." (X^{1A} 1528 fol. 826v–827r). Merlin intervened, asking that Josse Clichtove be appointed to determine whether the book was correct. The Parlement appointed two of its councillors to remove "injurious and biting words" from the works of all three authors concerned. As far as we know, the *Dialogues* never appeared in print.

³² *Tomus primus [–secundus] quatuor conciliorum generalium* (Paris: Jean Cornillau and Galliot Du Pré, 1524). Merlin's was the *editio princeps* of texts of early conciliar decrees.

³³ For the details of the case see Bense, "Noël Beda," pp. 289–97, 416–22. For the text of the Parlement's final determination, see "Une confrontation entre l'humanisme et la Tradition: Plaidoiries au Parlement de Paris à l'occasion d'une Apologie pour Origène," in Farge, *Le parti conservateur*, pp. 79–94.

³⁴ "Documentum quo docetur nullum theologum debere arceri ab examinatione doctrinarum fidei, nisi fuerit suspectus in fide." Beda entered this article in his *Primus liber* concerning Faculty decisions (BnF MS nouv. acq. lat. 1826, fols. 207r–210r). See the text in d'Argentré, *Collectio judiciorum*, 1, pt. 2, pp. 410–12.

³⁵ Bense, "Noël Beda," pp. 294–95, n. 52.

humanists were not suited to interpret and teach the sacred Scriptures. Unlike accredited doctors of theology, they had no formal training in theology and no apostolic mandate authorizing them to teach publicly or to publish books on theology and the Bible.

That conviction eventually brought him into direct conflict with Erasmus of Rotterdam. Like Lefèvre, Erasmus had for some years been advocating emendation of the Vulgate Bible and challenging the theologians' claims to an exclusive right to teach Scripture. Beda would surely have been aware of Erasmus' Paris publication of Lorenzo Valla's *Annotations on the New Testament*,³⁶ in which the seeds of many of Erasmus' own positions were already sown. Still, Beda and other Paris theologians were not as quick as those in Leuven, Cologne, Spain, or Rome to criticize Erasmus for his attacks on scholastic learning and for his satirical panorama of Church institutions in the *Praise of Folly* (1509). Nor did Beda rush to criticize Erasmus' Greek *New Testament* (1516) or his *Annotations on the New Testament*,³⁷ as did the Leuven-trained Englishman Edward Lee. Erasmus, however, accused Beda of helping Lee to publish this book.³⁸ This charge may indeed be true, because in his *Annotations*³⁹ against Lefèvre and Erasmus, Beda acknowledged enlisting others to refute Erasmus and helping arrange the publication of "other sound works" against him. He refers here specifically to sending his notes about Erasmus to help Pierre Cousturier with his book, *On Translation of the Bible and Rejection of New Interpretations*;⁴⁰ but this does not deny or preclude his helping to publish Lee's book as well.

³⁶ *In latinam Noui Testamenti interpretationem...Adnotationes* (Paris: Josse Bade for Jean Petit, c. 1505).

³⁷ Erasmus' *Annotations* appeared with the textual edition. For the critical edition of the annotations on the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, see Pieter Frans Hovingh, ed., *Annotationes in Novum Testamentum: pars prima: Praefatio, in Matthaeum, in Marcum, in Lucam*, in *Opera omnia* 6, pt. 5 (Amsterdam: Elsevier 2000). Erasmus defended his alterations of the Latin Vulgate text on the basis of the Greek text, on evidence about early and different Latin and Greek texts cited by the Fathers of the Church, and on the Latin usage of classical authors.

³⁸ *Apologia Edouardi Leei contra quorundam calumnias* [and] *Annotationes in Annotationes in Noui Testamenti Desiderii Erasmi* (Paris: Gilles de Gourmont, Widow of Berthold Rembolt, Conrad Resch, and Pierre Vidoue, [1520]).

³⁹ *Annotationum Natalis Bedae doctoris theologi Parisiensis in Iacobum Fabrum Stapulensem libri duo; et in Desiderium Erasmus Roterodamum liber unus, qui ordine tertius est* (Paris: Josse Bade, 27 May 1526; repr. Cologne: Petrus Quentell, 1526).

⁴⁰ *De tralatione Bibliae et novarum reprobatione interpretationum lucubrationes variorum voluminum lectione undequaque collectae suam capium periodum* (Paris: Pierre Vidoue for Jean Petit, 1525). Cousturier's book attacked the humanists more violently than did Beda. The

In 1523 Beda convened the Faculty of Theology more frequently than in any other year, before or after, to deal with manifestations of humanism and heresy. In addition to the on-going case against Jacques Merlin, the program of church reform in the diocese of Meaux, sponsored by Bishop Guillaume Briçonnet and animated by Lefèvre d'Etaples,⁴¹ was frequently on the agenda. The Faculty censured and published a small book⁴² against the preaching in Meaux of two doctors of theology, Martial Mazurier and Pierre Caroli,⁴³ both of whom would continue to occupy the attention of Beda and the Faculty in later years. Gérard Roussel, a student of Lefèvre, was also active in the Meaux reform.⁴⁴ Beda would face off against him again ten years later.

In that same year 1523, the Faculty censured Lefèvre's *Commentaries on the Four Gospels*.⁴⁵ The Parlement sent its *huissier* to the shop of Simon de Colines, the book's printer, ordered him to stop selling the book, and sent a copy of it to Beda. Colines was enjoined to appear in court to explain why he had printed it without first showing it to the Faculty of Theology, as required by law.⁴⁶ In this action, the Parlement was carrying out its three decrees of censorship issued on 18 March, 13 June, and 4 November 1521⁴⁷ mandating that no book concerning religion could be printed without the prior approbation of the Faculty of Theology.⁴⁸ Neither the Parlement nor the Faculty could proceed further against Lefèvre, however, as the king reserved judgment to his privy council, which dismissed the case. Only in 1525, when Francis I

Faculty of Theology approved it on 30 August 1524 (Farge, ed., *Registre des procès-verbaux*, no. 43A).

⁴¹ See Michel Veissière, *L'évêque Guillaume Briçonnet (1470–1534)* (Provins, 1986).

⁴² *Determinatio facultatis theologie parisiensis super aliquibus propositionibus certis a locis nuper ad eam delatis* (Paris: Pierre Vidoue for Jean Petit, December 1523). It was probably written for the Faculty by Josse Clichtove, whose reaction against the growing Lutheran movement led him to move away from his mentor, Lefèvre d'Etaples. For its text see d'Argentré, *Collectio judiciorum*, 1, pt. 2, pp. 374–79.

⁴³ See Farge, *Biographical Register*, pp. 318–22, no. 339, and pp. 65–71, no. 78.

⁴⁴ See Farge, *Le parti conservateur*, pp. 67–78, Document IV. The Meaux reform became more radical after extensive court proceedings in 1525 forced Briçonnet to back down.

⁴⁵ *Commentarii initiatorii in quattuor evangelia* (Meaux: Simon de Colines, 1523).

⁴⁶ See Documents II–A and II–B in Farge, *Le parti conservateur*, pp. 53–57.

⁴⁷ For the text of the third one of these, see Farge, *Le parti conservateur*, pp. 47–50, Documents I–A and I–B.

⁴⁸ James Farge, "Early Censorship of Printed Books in Paris: New Perspectives and Insights," in J.M. De Bujanda, ed., *Le contrôle des idées à la Renaissance* (Geneva, 1996), pp. 75–91.

was held captive for a year in Madrid, could Beda once again continue the Faculty's examination of Lefèvre's books.⁴⁹

The first documented evidence of a Paris censure of Erasmus came on 22 August 1523, when the Faculty of Theology concluded that new translations of the Bible from Hebrew and Greek into Latin—"for example, those of Erasmus and Jacques Lefèvre"—posed dangers to the faith of Christians and must be withdrawn from circulation.⁵⁰ Along similar lines Beda forced master Nicolas Maillard to retract his statement that theologians must necessarily know Hebrew and Greek.⁵¹

Beda's move to censure Erasmus received its first of several setbacks by royal intervention on 3 November 1523, when the king's confessor Guillaume Petit told the masters that Francis I intended to invite Erasmus to France and would write to them soon. Petit suggested that the doctors confront the king with a list of erroneous articles in Erasmus' books. Hesitant to risk challenging the king at this time, the Faculty declined; but, seeing that Beda wanted to carry on, it authorized him to send under his own name the list of errors that he had already drawn up.⁵²

In 1525, the Faculty condemned a number of French translations of Erasmus' books made by the evangelical humanist Louis de Berquin.⁵³ This was not a direct attack on Erasmus, since Berquin (to Erasmus' dismay) had mixed into the translations texts drawn from condemned reformers such as Guillaume Farel and Luther himself.⁵⁴ Ten months later, on 12 March 1526, the doctors formally condemned Berquin's translations without specifically mentioning Erasmus.⁵⁵

The major confrontation between Beda and Erasmus began when the printer Konrad Resch, who had already published Erasmus' *Paraphrases* on the Gospels of Matthew and John, requested the Parlement's *privilege*, or copyright, to print the *Paraphrase on Luke*. François Deloynes, one of the four presidents of the Parlement and one of its few judges

⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 78. Lefèvre and others, fearing arrest at this time, fled from Paris.

⁵⁰ Clerval, ed., *Registre des procès-verbaux*, p. 380. The Parlement of Paris later ratified and adopted this decision as its own policy.

⁵¹ Farge, ed., *Registre des procès-verbaux*, no. 27F.

⁵² "...sed posset honorandus magister noster Natalis Beda syndicus facultatis suo privato jure, si vellet, (quia ad hoc se ultro exhibuit)"; ibid., p. 401–02.

⁵³ See Farge, ed., *Registre des procès-verbaux*, no. 94A, no. 95A, and notes 44–46.

⁵⁴ See James K. Farge, "Les procès de Louis de Berquin: épisodes dans la lutte du Parlement de Paris contre l'absolutisme royal," *Histoire et Archives* 18 (juillet–septembre 2005) 49–77.

⁵⁵ Farge, ed., *Registre des procès-verbaux*, no. 145A.

who favored the humanist program of learning, duly complied with the court's censorship decrees by sending a copy to Beda to have it reviewed in the Faculty. After appointing three doctors of theology⁵⁶ to examine it, the Faculty met at least eight times to discuss the book.⁵⁷ On 12 February Beda led a long discussion about it, and on 5 March the doctors determined that Erasmus' doubt about Pauline authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews was detrimental to the authority and customs of the Church. Although no final judgment is recorded in the minutes,⁵⁸ we know that the Faculty sent the Parlement a negative report and a list of errors drawn from the book. As a result, the *Paraphrase on Luke* was never printed in Paris. However, Deloynes took it upon himself to send Erasmus the list of propositions that the Faculty had declared dangerous.

That prompted Erasmus to write to Beda, and this led to an exchange of ten additional letters between them.⁵⁹ The correspondence reveals much of Beda's antipathy towards humanism and Erasmus' defense of it. Erasmus, anxious to prevent a formal censure of his works, asked Beda to point out errors he perceived in the *Annotations on the New Testament* and other works (Ep. 1571). Beda replied that new versions and vernacular translations of the Bible, Erasmus' scorn for scholastic doctors, and his partiality for the works of Origen would bring harm to the Church. He recommended Erasmus pay more attention to

those of our school whom we call the "scholastics," men who were truly needed by the church at a period when it was in decline. No one should believe that chance led these men to use a new and simpler style; on the contrary it was the Spirit of God who wished it so and made this special concession to our times, for He guides the Church along different paths according to the needs of each particular age.⁶⁰

Erasmus' reply (Ep. 1581) was a lengthy *apologia* for his approach to exegesis and theology. He argues that they complement, but do not

⁵⁶ Guillaume Le Sauvaige (Collège d'Harcourt), Pieter Fabri (a Dominican friar from Nijmegen), and Jean Gillain (grand master of the Collège de Navarre).

⁵⁷ On 15, 18, 22 January, 6, 12, 16 February, 5 March, 1 April 1524 (new style). See Farge, ed., *Registre des procès-verbaux*, numbers 4B, 5A, 6B, 8A, 9A, B, 10A, 11A, 16A, 18c.

⁵⁸ The *procès-verbaux* are not complete in a large number of cases.

⁵⁹ Allen 6 and 7, Epp. 1571, 1579, 1581, 1591, 1596, 1609, 1610, 1642, 1679, 1685, 1906. For English translations see *Correspondence of Erasmus*, in CWE, vols. 11, 12, 13.

⁶⁰ CWE 11, Ep. 1579, pp. 118–19.

seek to replace, the scholastic approach.⁶¹ He denies Beda's charge that the rise of Luther and other heretics came from giving the Bible to the people. If some theologians have criticized his works, others—even Paris graduates—admire them. Finally, Erasmus protests Beda's refusal to address him as a theologian. When this letter was misdirected and returned to Erasmus, he wrote a shorter one, milder in tone (Ep. 1596), to accompany the first. Beda's answer (Ep. 1609) was friendly but condescending, pointing out that Josse Clichtove, formerly an avid supporter of Lefèvre, now submits his books to Beda for approval. He harshly criticizes Erasmus' book *Epistola apologetica de interdicto esu carniū* (1522), saying:

It is not hard to see...how dangerous your words were for the morals of Christian people.... You have given Luther's followers something to cast in your teeth: they will say, "We hold you bound by your own writings, since you agree with us on many points."⁶²

Responding to the request of Erasmus (in Ep. 1571), Beda attached to Ep. 1609 a new set of the annotations he had made on Erasmus' books.

Erasmus' next letter (Ep. 1610) was written simply to deny an accusation that he had insulted the Virgin Mary, and his Ep. 1620 is a moderate plea aimed at forestalling a censure by the Faculty of Theology. Beda's response (Ep. 1642) shows increasing impatience with Erasmus' refusal to retract his "errors." No one, he says, seems acceptable to Erasmus who does not agree with him. He warns Erasmus that he has written a book against his errors and appended it to his two books against Lefèvre d'Etaples. He defends the work of the Faculty in censoring modern errors:

I venture to suggest, my esteemed brother, that if the circle of theologians whom you call the "men of the Sorbonne" had not attacked the errors of our time as well as those old errors which were condemned long ago but are now enjoying a revival, Christian theology would have fallen into a worse state than it has. The fact that some people speak ill of them does not bother these theologians.... Moreover they are well thought of by all Catholics in France. So don't worry about their reputation in the future, but consider carefully in your own mind how suspect a man's faith must appear if he shows himself hostile towards theologians who are

⁶¹ This was entirely disingenuous: Erasmus' satirical rejection of scholasticism was already long a matter of public record.

⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 268.

simply doing their duty when they devote themselves to the examination of new doctrines and, by censoring various articles, warn the faithful of their real import.⁶³

Erasmus' reply (Ep. 1679) accuses Beda of confusing his own opinions with orthodox theology. Once again he defends the humanists' approach to the Bible: they seek to restore, not to destroy. The real innovators, Erasmus says bitterly, are the sophistic scholastics who have substituted Aristotle, Averroes, and Duns Scotus for the Bible.

Beda replied not with a letter but with his book, *Annotations*,⁶⁴ about which he had forewarned Erasmus. It contains 562 propositions excerpted from Lefèvre's *Commentaries* and Erasmus' *Paraphrases* on the New Testament,⁶⁵ each followed by Beda's refutation. The book is too lengthy⁶⁶ to describe here, but the following synopsis of its Preface gives Beda's reasons for writing it:

Luther has learned much [*Beda begins*] from the "theologizing humanists" who, educated only in the humanities and languages, contradict orthodox faith and disrupt the morals of the faithful. They disdain scholastic theologians as trifling, pretentious, and ignorant of God's word and of the Doctors of the Church. They hope in this way to appropriate the title of theologian for themselves. Yet their books show how perverse they are.

Just as craftsmen learn their trade from elder masters, so do Christians reading the Bible need the guidance of the Church. Yet these self-proclaimed masters of the sacred page disagree among themselves, as did the heretics of old. When trying to explain difficult passages, they too fall into old heresies about faith and morals, free will, church councils, penance, veneration of the saints, and the constitution and rites of the Church.

Lefèvre replied in a friendly way [*Beda continues*] to my frank and charitable monition about the doctrine in his books, and asked me to send comments about them. I told him that interpreters and paraphrasers must never offer variants to texts that were inspired by the Holy Spirit. Saint

⁶³ Ibid., pp. 368–69.

⁶⁴ See note 36.

⁶⁵ He treats Lefèvre's commentaries on Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Timothy and Hebrews, and on the four Gospels. For Erasmus he treats the *Paraphrases* on Matthew, Luke, John and Mark; the *Paraphrases* on Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Thessalonians, Timothy, and Titus; and he finishes with a few pages on the *Paraphrases* of the seven "canonical," or apostolic Epistles. See Erika Rummel, "Why Noël Beda did not like Erasmus' *Paraphrases*," in Hilmar Pabel and Mark Vessey, eds., *Holy Scripture Speaks: The Production and Reception of Erasmus' Paraphrases on the New Testament* (Toronto, 2002): 265–78.

⁶⁶ Bense, "Noël Beda," requires seventy-two pages (595–667) to convey a summary of its contents, which comprise 292 folios (584 pages) of densely set type in the Cologne edition.

Paul and Saint Jerome both said that it is reckless, impious, and bordering on sacrilege to clothe the pious and humble words of the Bible with the allurements of pagan letters in order to achieve a cultured and polite style. Skill in letters is a gift from God but must never be used to bring people to ruin, as the humanists do. A true theologian will welcome any style the humanists choose to use, if only they will write orthodox books.

Erasmus, too, [*Beda says*] asked me to point out errors in his books. What I sent to him I am ready to submit to the judgment of wise men, the apostolic see, and the universal Church. But Erasmus never yields to a single argument or counsel, no matter how sound or good. Instead of correcting his errors, he sent a letter to the Faculty of Theology⁶⁷ in which he defends everything he ever wrote. The doctors will respond in the light of Scripture and the Fathers. Critics of the Faculty characterize it with slander and colorful expressions; but I dare them to produce a single censure by the Faculty that contravenes Catholic truth, piety, or justice.

The Church [*Beda concludes*] will never dispose of Luther as long as the books of Erasmus and Lefèvre circulate. Of the two, Lefèvre has been the more restrained and prudent; but Erasmus piles error upon error, replying impudently at great length.⁶⁸

Erasmus petitioned King Francis I to forbid the publication of Beda's book,⁶⁹ charging that Beda was blocking the progress of learning in France, that he was making the University of Paris a laughing-stock in Europe, and that he was even plotting to seize power on the pretext of the king's favoring heresy. The letter arrived too late to stop the book's appearance, and the printer had already sent copies to many major cities; but the king ordered the confiscation of every unsold copy.⁷⁰ The Cologne printer Petrus Quentell therefore lost no time in reprinting Beda's book.

Erasmus wrote three books to respond formally and harshly to Beda's *Annotations*, and would later write two more.⁷¹ After a year and a half,

⁶⁷ Ep. 1723.

⁶⁸ I am grateful to Mark Crane for allowing me to use his unpublished English translation of Beda's Preface from which I have drawn this synopsis.

⁶⁹ Ep. 1722.

⁷⁰ Paris, Archives nationales, X^{1a} 1529, fols. 367v–369v (17 August 1526); Farge, ed., *Registre des procès-verbaux*, pp. 142–43, no. 161b, c; cf. Farge, *Orthodoxy and Reform*, pp. 260–61.

⁷¹ The first three are *Prologus supputationis errorum in censuris Beddae* (*Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami opera omnia*, ed. J. Leclerc, 10 vols. [1703–6, repr. 1961–62] = LB IX, 442–50); *Divinationes ad notata per Bedam de Paraphrasi Erasmi in Matthaeum, et primo de duabus praemissis epistolis* (LB IX, 454–96); *In Natalis Bedae censuras erroneas elenchus* (LB IX, 496–516), all from the Froben Press. The more substantial rebuttal was *Supputatio errorum in censuris Beddae* (LB IX, 516–702). Erasmus added a fifth, short pamphlet: *Responsio ad notulas Bedaicas* (LB IX, 702–20). The titles in LB differ somewhat from those used by the

he wrote a final letter (Ep. 1906) to Beda exhorting him to reexamine his censures—or, as Erasmus calls them, his calumnies.⁷²

In the meantime, under Beda's direction, the Faculty met numerous times in committee and general session before voting unanimously on 16 May 1526 to censure Erasmus' most popular work, the *Colloquies*. It was deemed to be particularly unsuitable for young people, on the grounds that it contained satirical criticism of fasting and abstinence, veneration of the Virgin Mary and the saints, virginity, and the consecrated life.⁷³ Then, on 16 December 1527, the doctors pronounced a general condemnation of several of Erasmus' books. Six months later, on 23 June 1528, Beda convinced the whole university to ratify the censure. This decision, however, was neither circulated nor issued in print until 1531.⁷⁴

Beda's last personal attack on Erasmus was included in his book, *Apology of Noël Beda, Theologian, against Clandestine Lutherans*.⁷⁵ He wrote it principally in response to an anonymous little book entitled *Twelve Articles of Infidelity of Master Noël Beda... Drawn from the Book of his Annotations... Confounded and Reproved*.⁷⁶ After answering its charges,⁷⁷ Beda replies to sixty propositions drawn from Erasmus' *Supputatio errorum* against him. Among other things, he accuses Erasmus of holding that

Collected Works of Erasmus (Toronto). See the analysis of these works in Erika Rummel, *Erasmus and His Catholic Critics*, 2, pp. 29–43. The analysis in Bense, "Noël Beda," pp. 670–97, includes extensive extracts from Erasmus' books.

⁷² We cannot be certain that Beda received this letter, which went astray. Erasmus sent it again, but Beda did not publish it (as he did all the other letters of Erasmus that he received) in his *Apologia adversus clandestinos lutheranos* (Paris: Josse Bade, 1529); reprinted in d'Argentré, *Collectio judiciorum*, 3, pt. 2, pp. 2–80.

⁷³ Farge, ed., *Registre des procès-verbaux*, no. 152A.

⁷⁴ The Faculty of Theology's condemnation was issued in print (Paris: Josse Bade, July 1531). Erasmus responded to it with his *Declarationes ad censuras Lutetiae sub nomine facultatis theologiae parisiensis* (Basel, January 1532).

⁷⁵ *Apologia Natalis Bedae theologi adversus clandestinos lutheranos* (Paris: Josse Bade, 1 February 1529).

⁷⁶ *Duodecim articuli infidelitatis magistri Natalis Beddae... Ex libro suarum annotationum (similibus haeresibus & articulis infidelitatis referto & blasphemis quamplurimis scatente) hic ad verbum fideliter excerpti, reprobantur & confutantur* (N.p., n.d.). Beda believed the book was composed by Louis de Berquin, and most modern authors presume the same. But Berquin denied under oath that he was the author, and neither his character nor his religion would have tolerated a false oath. I concur with Bense that the author was more likely Beda's long-time adversary Jacques Merlin, whose lawyer had spoken in the Parlement of "a large number of erroneous propositions, suspected in the faith, drawn and excerpted from the books of Beda (Paris, Archives nationales X^{1A} 8344, fol. 17r); see Farge, *Le parti conservateur*, p. 90, note 101.

⁷⁷ See Bense, "Noël Beda," pp. 699–716.

all particular religions are no different from the religions of the Gentiles, which are thought up by men.⁷⁸ Erasmus countered with *Some Little Notes against the Trifling Ditties of Beda*.⁷⁹ In it he calls Beda “the most stupid of bipeds,” and adds:

Away with your pretences, unhappy hypocrite; all your writings breathe nothing but a mind crazed with hatred.... Far be it from me to worry about a hot-headed monster that is also impotent, stupid, doting, and out of his mind.... If [King Francis I] had fully understood the disposition of this Beda, he... would have had him deported to a place in the most remote of regions. May God, the pious and merciful protector of the Catholic faith and church, grant this. Amen.⁸⁰

Meanwhile, Noël Beda continued to play a strategic role, often in collaboration with the Parlement of Paris, in numerous cases brought against accused heretics, some of whom were humanists. For example,⁸¹ he had a hand in the third imprisonment and trial of Louis de Berquin,⁸² who was burned at the stake in April 1529.⁸³ In 1530 he played a leading (but unsuccessful) role in opposing Faculty approval of the annulment of the marriage between Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon. In taking this stand he opposed at the same time King Francis I, who lobbied strongly for Henry’s side.⁸⁴ Beda’s strategy was to delay a vote until the pope—who had already refused the annulment—could be consulted again. The extant correspondence in the case includes intimations from the king that Beda will face consequences for his opposition.⁸⁵

Beda’s last direct action against Erasmus occurred on 3 April 1532, when he showed the doctors the book of Erasmus’ response to their censure of him. The deputies appointed to examine Erasmus’ book listed so many propositions that they were asked to select the most important ones. On 2 May Beda concluded that all of them had previously been condemned by the Faculty and that so pernicious a book

⁷⁸ Cited by Bense, “Noël Beda,” pp. 717–18.

⁷⁹ *Notatiunculae quaedam extemporales ad naenias Bedaicas* (Basel, March 1529).

⁸⁰ Translated in Bense, “Noël Beda,” pp. 724–25. The king would, in due time, follow Erasmus’ suggestion.

⁸¹ Many others are recorded in Farge, ed., *Registre des procès-verbaux*; and Bense, “Noël Beda,” pp. 733–48, 775–93, surveys them in detail.

⁸² See above, p. 00.

⁸³ See Farge, “Les procès de Louis de Berquin,” p. 72, n. 86.

⁸⁴ Here we should recall the similar action of his mentor Standonck against the divorce and remarriage of King Louis XII.

⁸⁵ See Farge, *Orthodoxy and Reform*, pp. 135–50; extensive documentation can be found in Bense, “Noël Beda,” pp. 749–72.

should be suppressed. The Faculty decided to consult the Parlement, the papal judges-delegate (who had condemned Louis de Berquin), and the bishop's court. But no one, not even Beda, rose to the challenge to respond in a private capacity to Erasmus' book.⁸⁶

On 1 February 1530, the Faculty's beadle was delegated to inform the printer Claude Chevallon that the doctors were not pleased with his recent printing of Erasmus' edition of Saint Ambrose (1530). He warned that, if he carried out his intention to print Erasmus' edition of Saint Augustine, he would contravene an order of Parlement and face serious consequences.⁸⁷ It may seem purely spiteful on Beda's part to be concerned about Erasmus' editions of two great Church Fathers, but Beda was concerned not about the texts but about Erasmus' introductions and annotations. Erasmus himself, in advising the town council of Basel to suppress anonymous works or books printed clandestinely, wrote this: "...even with [texts such as the works of Saint Jerome] one needs to be on one's guard about prefaces and commentaries to ensure that no dangerous material is added."⁸⁸

Two final actions of Beda, both involving opposition to interests of King Francis I, led in each case to his exile from Paris. The first occurred when Beda mounted opposition to the sermons that Gérard Roussel was preaching during Lent of 1533. Roussel, a former student and long-time colleague of Lefèvre d'Etaples, had already come under fire in 1523 for his part in the diocesan reform in Meaux; and, like Lefèvre, he was a protégé of the king's sister, Marguerite of Navarre. Beda charged that the crowds who heard Roussel preach considered him to be a heretic. After a series of investigations, King Francis I stopped Roussel from preaching but merely placed him in the custody of his sister. He exiled Beda from Paris, charging that Beda had caused division and disturbance in the Faculty of Theology. Walter Bense⁸⁹ concluded that the king was acting on charges made by Beda's enemies

⁸⁶ Farge, ed., *Registre des procès-verbaux*, numbers 339B, 340A, 341A.

⁸⁷ Ibid., no. 280E. Chevallon came in person to the Faculty on 15 February. He presented a copy of the Augustine edition (probably the Basel printing), said it had been corrected, and asked for approval to print it. The Faculty appointed deputies to examine it (ibid., no. 282E). The minutes mention no outcome; but the edition appeared in ten volumes from Chevallon's press in 1531 and 1532, without mention of Faculty approval. Erasmus' name was omitted from the title page of the first volume, but it was restored in the other volumes.

⁸⁸ CWE Ep. 1539 (January 1525): 53–55.

⁸⁹ See Bense, "Noël Beda," p. 813.

that he controlled a small but fanatical cadre of doctors to impose his will on the entire Faculty. Bense further suggests that in exiling Beda the king was fulfilling his own earlier threats against Beda for leading the opposition to King Henry VIII's annulment.⁹⁰ Certain English diplomats drew the same conclusion. They and a host of reformers were disappointed when, late in 1533, the king recalled Beda to Paris to be interrogated about a spurious pamphlet, written in his name, alleging that Beda had converted to the reformist cause and was urging the king to do the same.⁹¹ Beda of course had no trouble disavowing those claims; and a French ambassador in Switzerland complained to the council of Geneva about the book that misrepresented Beda, "the greatest doctor of France."⁹²

Beda had scarcely returned from exile when he took another step that would not ingratiate himself with the king. He lodged a complaint with the Parlement of Paris about the four *lecteurs royaux*⁹³ whom King Francis I had appointed to teach Hebrew and Greek. Beda made it clear to the court that he had no complaint about their teaching those languages but only that they were using and commenting on Bible texts to do so. Moreover, their habit of showing how Hebrew and Greek texts differed from the Latin Vulgate was a serious violation of the jurisdiction of accredited theologians.⁹⁴ The Parlement agreed with Beda, but the case was removed from its jurisdiction and sent to the king's privy council. Surprisingly, Beda's position found support even there: according to Pierre Danès, the *lecteurs royaux* would have been lost if not for the sole intervention of Bishop Jean Du Bellay.⁹⁵ Beda's

⁹⁰ That issue, however, was one of the few instances in which Beda failed to carry the Faculty's decision.

⁹¹ *Confession et raison de foy de maistre Noel Beda docteur en theologie et sindique de la sacree universite a Paris: envoyee au treschrestien roy de France, Francois premier de ce nom*. The real author has never been identified; but Bense, "Noël Beda," p. 831, judging that the book is close to the theological positions of Lefèvre d'Étaples, believes it should be ascribed to one of his associates, Pierre Caroli. See on this matter Gabrielle Berthoud, "Livres pseudo-Catholiques de contenu protestant," in *Aspects de la propagande religieuse* (Geneva, 1957), pp. 143–54.

⁹² Bense, "Noël Beda," p. 832.

⁹³ They were the nucleus of what became the *Collège royal* in the seventeenth century and the *Collège de France* in the nineteenth. See André Tuilier, ed., *Histoire du Collège de France, I: La création, 1530–1560* (Paris, 2006).

⁹⁴ On this issue see Farge, *Le parti conservateur*, pp. 117–31, Documents VII A–C.

⁹⁵ See the letter of Danès to Jean Du Bellay in Louis Delaruelle, "Deux lettres inédites de Pierre Danès," *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, Ecole française de Rome (1899), p. 176.

actions were thus not those of a madman. He had found support in all echelons of the kingdom. At the university, Ignatius of Loyola, who was not yet the powerful figure he would become, dissuaded his friend Jerónimo Nadal from attending the classes of the king's lecturers.⁹⁶ Another early Jesuit, Nicolás Bobadilla, reported how Ignatius commented that several men in Paris lapsed into heresy after studying Greek without a solid theological foundation.⁹⁷

To understand Beda's position in this suit and, indeed, in his long struggles against the humanists, we must consider that social order at that time depended on two factors: status, to which one was born, and office, to which one was raised by duly constituted authority. The appointment of the *lecteurs royaux* authorized them to teach languages and literature, subjects in which they were duly qualified. Beda staunchly maintained that they overstepped their expertise and their mandate by lecturing on the Bible, since they had no formal training in theology and no canonical investiture as a theologian by the chancellor of a proper university. As Beda had written in 1522, it was the particular right and duty of properly trained and vested theologians to judge doctrine and to censure persons who posed danger to the faith of others. Allowing non-theologians publicly to usurp the office of theologian was, to someone with Beda's overarching concern for tradition, inviting social and ecclesiastical chaos.

In March 1534, Beda and one of his long-time colleagues were imprisoned on royal order, apparently for high treason.⁹⁸ In all likelihood, this was a renewed punishment for opposing Francis I's support of King Henry VIII's divorce. According to the duke of Norfolk, Marguerite de Navarre accused Beda of telling the pope that Henry and Francis did not live like Christian kings.⁹⁹

⁹⁶ Jerónimo Nadal, *Scholia in Constitutiones et Declarationes sancti patris Ignatii* (Prati in Etruria, 1883), pp. 81–82, cited in Gabriel Codina Mir, S.J., *Aux sources de la pédagogie des Jésuites* (Rome, 1968), p. 79.

⁹⁷ "Qui graecisabant, lutheranizabant." *Bobadillae Monumenta. Nicolai Alphonsi de Bobadilla, sacerdotis e Societate Iesu, gesta et scripta* (Madrid, 1913), p. 614, cited by Codina Mir, *Aux sources de la pédagogie*, p. 79. Humanism would later, of course, have a significant place in the curriculum of the wide network of Jesuit schools.

⁹⁸ Nicolas Cop used the term *lèse-majesté* in a letter to Martin Butzer. Cop himself was later arrested after seeming to favor heresy in his inaugural speech as rector of the university. See A.-L. Herminjard, ed., *Correspondance des réformateurs dans les pays de langue français*, 3 (1886–97, repr. Nieuwkoop, 1965), no. 458.

⁹⁹ See Bense, "Noël Beda," pp. 836–37, notes 183, 185.

Early in 1535, Beda was forced to undergo what was called an *amende honorable*: he was made to appear in public, barefooted and holding a burning torch, to witness the burning of his papers and to ask God and men to pardon his errors against the truth and his actions against the king. In July he was imprisoned in the abbey of Mont-Saint-Michel where he died eighteen months later in ignominious circumstances on 28 (or 8) January 1537.¹⁰⁰

The struggles of the “conservative party” in Paris against humanism and the Protestant Reformation did not end with the death of Noël Beda. Although humanism eventually earned wide acceptance in French intellectual life and French Protestants were granted toleration in 1598, it can nevertheless be argued that Beda’s early and staunch defense of Church tradition established in France the beginning of what has been called the Counter-Reformation and that he was a key factor in keeping France in the Catholic fold.

¹⁰⁰ The abbey of Mont-Saint-Michel had housed state prisoners since the mid-fifteenth century. Beda was enclosed (and apparently died) in the prison’s *cage de fer*, a 2m 80 square cage made of wood planks and iron bands. It was suspended from a ring-bolt in the cell’s vault, causing it to oscillate as its occupant shifted his weight. Beda was the first but not the last prisoner known to inhabit the cage at Mont-Saint-Michel. See Paul Gout, *Le Mont-Saint-Michel. Histoire de l’abbaye et de la ville. Étude archéologique et architecturale des monuments*, 1 (Paris, 1910; repr. Brussels, 1979), pp. 363–64. At least one other such instrument of torture existed in France, but the death of Cardinal Jean de La Balue (1491) in it is now considered doubtful.

THE CAMPAIGN AGAINST BIBLICAL HUMANISTS
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF LEUVEN

MARTIN DORP AND EDWARD LEE

Cecilia Asso

(trans. by Denis Robichaud)

Most of our information on the life and activities of Martin Dorp and Edward Lee comes from Erasmian sources, that is, principally from Erasmus' vast correspondence.¹ Naturally their intellectual activities were not circumscribed by their relationship with the humanist from Rotterdam, but it was that relationship which gave them fame and importance in their own time and it is therefore the focus of this chapter.

Both men pursued an academic career in theology, which led to the title *Magister Noster*, and both engaged in the study of the *humanae literae*. For these reasons they were both drawn into the intellectual orbit of the author of the first "critical" edition of the New Testament. During the years 1514–1519, both of them entered into a polemic with Erasmus which concerned the relationship between theology and the *humanae literae*. Finally, the setting of both the disputes was the lively university city of Leuven, which had a large student population, offered colleges of diverse cultural orientations and, most significantly, had an important theology faculty.

The faculty of theology had been established in Leuven less than a century earlier (in 1432) on the initiative of Pope Martin V with a view of creating a centre of theological studies loyal to papal authority.² After all, the Great Schism, during which the authority of the pope was sharply contested by the conciliar movement, was barely over. According to the conciliar doctrine, the Holy Spirit did not speak to

¹ For an initial survey of the persons mentioned in this article see CEBR; Erasmus' disputes with Dorp and Lee are treated in Erika Rummel, *Erasmus and his Catholic Critics*, 1 (Nieuwkoop, 1989), pp. 1–13 (Dorp) and 95–120 (Lee). On Erasmus and Dorp see especially *The Complete Works of St. Thomas More*, 15 (New Haven and London, 1986). On Erasmus and Lee see especially Robert Coogan, *Erasmus, Lee and the Correction of the Vulgate: The Shaking of the Foundations* (Geneva, 1992); Cecilia Asso, *La Teologia e la grammatica. La controversia tra Erasmo ed Edward Lee* (Florence, 1993); the recent critical edition of *Annotationes in Annotationes Eduardi Lei*, edited by Erika Rummel in ASD IX/4 (2003) and the English translation in CWE 72 also by Erika Rummel, with introductions.

² On the Faculty of Theology and its relationship with Erasmus, see below pp. 197–214.

the Church through the pope, but rather through the general council formed by the bishops of the universal church. In other words, concerning matters of faith, the ecumenical council rather than the pope was the voice of authority for Christians. The most prestigious advocate of this doctrine, the French theologian Jean de Gerson (1363–1429), taught in the equally prestigious Faculty of Theology of Paris. When the papacy emerged from the crisis of the Great Schism and reaffirmed its own authority, it was clearly necessary to create a counterbalance to the Parisian faculty, which was impregnated with conciliarism and Gallicism and was more loyal to the French crown than to Rome. Leuven, by contrast, was to be faithful to the principle of papal supremacy.³ The university was situated in the region of Flanders, especially dear to the young Charles of Habsburg, who inherited the Spanish crown and its dominions in 1516, succeeded to the Habsburg lands in 1519, and was elected Holy Roman Emperor the same year.

In the early 1990s, Lisa Jardine, in her brilliant study *Erasmus, Man of Letters*, suggested that Leuven became important only in the fictitious world created by the letters written by Erasmus and his friends and disciples—letters published in collections, in prefaces or in book dedications which had the principal aim of publicizing the humanistic programme.⁴ This fascinating (and here simplified) interpretation does not appear entirely plausible, however. In the early sixteenth century Leuven was important because it was the location of one of the most influential institutions in Europe for students interested in theology or the *humanae literae*.

In this institution, Martin Dorp and Edward Lee occupied rather different positions. Martin Dorp, while proceeding through the regular stages of an academic career in the faculty of theology, was Erasmus' disciple, his editorial collaborator, and indeed his friend. As we shall see, his debate with Erasmus over the merits of humanism and theology did not result in a complete rupture of their relationship. One might consider their debate a type of *gioco delle parti*.⁵ The Englishman Edward Lee, by contrast, arrived in Leuven from Oxford with recommendations

³ The following work is still useful on theology in Leuven during Erasmus' age: Jacques Etienne, *Spiritualisme érasmien et théologiens louvanistes. Un changement de problématique au début du XVI^e siècle* (Leuven, 1965).

⁴ Lisa Jardine, *Erasmus, Man of Letters. The Construction of Charisma in Print* (Princeton, 1993), pp. 11–14.

⁵ Jardine, *Erasmus, Man of Letters*, pp. 111–122, esp. p. 112: "In other words, the story of the dispute between Erasmus and Dorp is a performance."

from Erasmus' English friends, but was soon alienated from the humanist in every respect. He may have found friends within the powerful circle of the faculty of theology—indeed, Erasmus accused him of being hand in glove with the theologians. In the rest of the university, Lee was certainly unpopular and soon became the victim of Erasmus' zealous disciples and a target of caricature and biting satire.

The criticism that Dorp and Lee voiced against Erasmus represent two vantage points from which to observe the chasm between Erasmian humanism, that is, the function that he attributed to the study and use of the *humanae literae*, and the type of humanism that had found its way into academic culture. Although Dorp was close to the Erasmian context, while Lee was foreign to and isolated from it, they were both spokesmen for a theological culture which, although affected by humanism, firmly and consciously refused to abandon the scholastic method and the traditional heuristic tools.

Between 1504 and 1514, while Erasmus was living in England and travelling in Italy evolving his particular brand of Christian humanism, Dorp pursued literary studies at the *Collegium Lili* in Leuven. At the same time, he also devoted himself to theology under the tutelage of Jean Briart of Ath, then vice-chancellor of the Faculty.⁶ In 1514, now almost 30 years old, Dorp found himself at a crossroad: his doctorate in theology was near completion, but his literary activities had increased in the meantime. We know that he was the only student of the humanistic *Collegium Lili* to obtain the title *Magister Noster*. We may conjecture that the Faculty required from Dorp proof of his detachment from the *humanae literae*, that is, from the humanistic studies, before granting him the title, but we cannot confirm it. Yet there is the fact that in September 1514 Dorp wrote a letter to Erasmus, which has become famous.⁷ It was inspired by a letter written by Erasmus to Servatius Roger the previous June. In that letter Erasmus explained to his old friend (and now his superior) the reasons why he had not returned to the monastery of Steyn, a breach of the vow to which he was still bound. He noted that he was serving religion by preparing the edition of the works of Jerome and the Greek edition of the New Testament. For Erasmus, to be engaged in this work was the best way to express his

⁶ H. De Jongh, *L'Ancienne Faculté de théologie de Leuven au premier siècle de son existence (1432–1540)* (Leuven, 1911), pp. 127–28.

⁷ Ep. 304.

pietas.⁸ The letter to Roger, as often happened in that century, quickly became public domain, and the theological community thus came to know that a *graeculus*, a mere philologist, had begun work on the Sacred Scriptures. Dorp chose to act as a mediator between the scandalized theologians and Erasmus, trying to inject a tone of moderation. He sought to dissuade Erasmus from pursuing an enterprise, which might be considered sacrilegious by many readers. The letter he wrote to his illustrious friend undoubtedly demonstrated his loyalty towards the *corpus theologorum*. Erasmus first read it during the return trip from England to Basel and responded in May 1515 with an epistle that had a wide circulation, since it was, from that time on, published as a preface to *The Praise of Folly*.⁹ Dorp replied on August 27, 1515, and the relationship between the two men became so strained that Thomas More, a friend of both, thought it appropriate to intervene. Accordingly he wrote a letter to the young theologian, urging reconciliation.¹⁰

The polemic, consisting of the three letters cited, never took on the acerbic tone that characterizes Erasmus' later disputes, perhaps because Dorp did not seem to Erasmus a stubborn adversary, but rather an uncertain disciple who could still be won over to the cause of *vera theologia*. Yet one finds delineated there the fundamental themes of his controversies—the issues dividing the theologians from Erasmus, which can be observed even more closely in the controversy with Lee.

Dorp divides his argument into two parts: in the first he reproaches Erasmus for having implicated the theologians in the *Praise of Folly*; in the second he implores him to modify his intended edition of the New Testament, which he saw as unnecessary and a potential cause of grave harm to the Christian doctrine.¹¹ The two arguments appear distinct, but in fact constitute the essential elements of a single discourse. According to Dorp, the author of the *Encomium Moriae*, who irreverently attacked the theological faculties and the clergy as a whole, could not now undertake to study and edit the sacred text as if it were his unquestionable right. Dorp does not intend to deny Erasmus the right to emend the

⁸ Ep. 296.

⁹ Ep. 337.

¹⁰ Dorp's reply to Erasmus is Ep. 347. More's letter to Dorp is published in E.F. Rogers, ed., *The Correspondence of Sir Thomas More* (Princeton, 1947), pp. 27–74 (Ep. 15, 21 October 1515); and in *The Complete Works of St. Thomas More*, 15, pp. 1–127 (commentary on pp. 496–544).

¹¹ Allen, Ep. 304: 15–80 and 81–146. In fact, Dorp does not ask Erasmus to completely abandon his work on the New Testament, but to publish a Latin translation that remedies the Vulgate's harsh style (see lines 141–146).

Scriptures merely because he does not belong to the *corpus theologorum*.¹² Rather he disapproves of Erasmus' lack of respect or deference to the authority of the theologians who had long been in charge of interpreting Holy Writ. This is the substance of Dorp's accusation: You have ridiculed the theological profession as a whole, denigrating them and lowering their prestige in the eyes of the people, and now you take on a task which is traditionally theirs. Would that not indicate that you desire to eliminate their *raison d'être*? In his argumentation, Dorp links *The Praise of Folly*'s with Erasmus' philological work on the New Testament and thereby puts his finger on the essence of Erasmus' religious work: he sought to define a new type of theology and a new type of theologian.¹³ To Erasmus, who as usual defends the *Moria* by objecting that he was mocking and satirizing human foibles, not the theologians specifically, Dorp could have replied: "but the theologians are the only ones to whom you want to teach their trade."

The second part of Dorp's epistle lists the reasons why an edition of the New Testament, as conceived by Erasmus, might be considered superfluous and even harmful. Dorp's reasons largely agree with the positions that, as we shall see, Lee assumes in his *Annotationes*. Dorp argues above all that it is necessary to decide whether the Vulgate stands in need of emendation. For how is it possible that the Church's doctors and councils used a corrupt text for so many centuries? Supposing that the Vulgate ought to be corrected, why would Erasmus think that such corrections should be based on the Greek text? The Greek Church had gone through centuries of schisms and heresies. It follows that its text was suspect. There was reason to think that they preserved the Word of God in a less accurate form than the Latin Church. Even supposing that there were accurate Greek codices, how could Erasmus know whether he was placing his trust in reliable or corrupt copies?¹⁴ Erasmus might protest that his work was innocuous, but Dorp concluded that introducing the idea that there existed a Sacred Text different from the official Vulgate would spread doubt among Christians about the authority of the Vulgate itself.

You will tell me: 'I would not want you to change anything in the copy that you own, and I do not think that the Latin version is erroneous. I merely wish to show that which I found in the Greek codices that is

¹² Other opponents, including Luther, use this argument.

¹³ On this problem see Asso, *La Teologia e la grammatica*, chapter II, paragraph 2.

¹⁴ Allen, Ep. 304: 91–96, 98–106, and 111–118.

different from the Latin. What evil could come of this?" Naturally, my dear Erasmus, much evil could come of this! Many people will begin to discuss the integrity of the text of the Sacred Scriptures, and many will begin to doubt even if only a small part appears to be false, not, I say, because of your work, but only through hearsay. Then what Augustine writes to Jerome will happen: 'If one admits, even with the best intentions, that there are errors in the Sacred Scripture what will remain authoritative in it?'¹⁵

Erasmus' reply to Dorp's first letter was both an apology of his own work and an exhortation to his friend to choose the path of true theology, that is, the study of the Sacred Scriptures founded on language skills. Here Erasmus develops a veritable rhetorical climax. He begins with the tongue-in-cheek assertion that he never wished to offend true theology or true theologians, not even in the *Moria* (but he does not specify what he means by the words "true theology" and "true theologians"). He proceeds with subtle arguments: "Ah, if only you were able, my dear Dorp, to look directly at the thoughts in my mind without the help of words! You would then understand how I keep silent on so many things for the sake of prudence!"¹⁶ The discourse reaches its climax with an affectionate appeal to the young scholar:

Believe me, if you were to add the knowledge of the Greek language and its literature to your brilliant qualities, I am sure that I, and others, could expect great things from you, things that no modern theologian, until now, has ever accomplished. If, instead, you are of the opinion that true piety ought to scorn human erudition and you believe that one arrives at the knowledge of God more quickly by transfiguring oneself in Christ, since one can more fully contemplate all that is worthy of knowledge by the light of faith rather than in the books of men, then, in this case, I will not have any difficulty subscribing to your opinion. However, if at the current state of human knowledge, you propose to reach the true knowledge of theology without knowing any languages, and above all without knowing the language in which a large part of the Sacred Scriptures has come down to us, then your way is completely erroneous.¹⁷

These affirmations are more than a simple exhortation to theologians to learn Greek.¹⁸ They eliminate scholastic theology from the number

¹⁵ Allen, Ep. 304: 131–140.

¹⁶ Allen, Ep. 337: 432–434.

¹⁷ Allen, Ep. 337: 615–627.

¹⁸ This is the conclusion found in Pierre Mesnard, "Humanisme et théologie dans la controverse entre Erasme et Dorpius," *Filosofia* 14 (1963), 885–900.

of possible ways to know God, since—as Erasmus indicates—mysticism and the philological study of the Scriptures were the only means to be used.

Dorp's response demonstrates how clearly he understood the revolutionary aspect of Erasmus' alternative. His tone is harsher than in the first epistle. Would Erasmus give the power to the grammarians? he asks. Let them come and teach us their new theology! It will be a ridiculous spectacle.¹⁹ It would be better for Erasmus to put more trust in scholastic theologians and to hold their opinion in higher esteem than the opinion of the bishops who are protecting him, since everyone knows the morality and wisdom of modern bishops!²⁰

This resolute stance provoked, as we have already said, the intervention of Thomas More, while Erasmus refrained from publishing a reply.²¹ Nor was More's letter, which today is considered a true manifesto of the humanistic method against scholastic dialectic, printed at the time of the dispute (the first edition is from 1563),²² when presumably it circulated in manuscript form.²³

As it seems, More's intervention resulted in Dorp's "conversion" to the Erasmian method. In fact, he continued to be named among the Dutch humanist's supporters and, indeed, echoed Erasmian positions. This led to reprisals from the Faculty of Theology.²⁴ In contrast to the bitterness of all other polemics in which Erasmus was implicated, polemics that ended in a permanent breakdown of personal relationships, the conflict between Erasmus and Dorp was dissipated without such consequences. The case is exceptional, moreover, in that Erasmus did not have the last word and continued to treat his adversary benevolently. Yet in essence Dorp's criticism was not so very different from Edward Lee's: both struck at the core of Erasmus' theological project. On the basis of these considerations it has been suggested that this first polemic concerning the application of the humanistic method to theology was in fact a construct of Erasmus and his friends,

¹⁹ Allen, Ep. 347: 156–158.

²⁰ Allen, Ep. 347: 77–79 and 22–26.

²¹ It is not certain that Erasmus ever wrote a reply. If he did, it was never printed and it has not come down to us. See Rummel, *Erasmus and his Catholic Critics*, 1, p. 8 and note 29 (p. 194).

²² On the history of the text see *The Complete Works of St. Thomas More*, 15, pp. cxix–cxxiv.

²³ Rummel, *Erasmus and his Catholic Critics*, 1, p. 8.

²⁴ See above all Rummel, *Erasmus and his Catholic Critics*, 1, p. 10.

especially if we take into account that the sources we have at our disposal consist predominantly of writings published by or under the control of Erasmus. The purpose of the construct, according to this hypothesis, was to publicize the editions of the classics which the Erasmians were completing during these years, among them, significantly, Rudolf Agricola's *De inventione dialectica*.²⁵ The promotion of the new didactic and heuristic method, which the Erasmians placed in opposition to the dialectical method practised in the Universities, was the goal of this propaganda and the purpose of their editorial activities.²⁶ Whatever the Affair Dorp may be, it informs us of the intellectual atmosphere in the first twenty years of the sixteenth century. The activities of the Erasmian humanists were unquestionably founded on a high level of expertise and sought not only an improvement in the fields of philology and literature, but a reform of theological studies, grounded in a new philosophy of language.

* * *

Edward Lee was around thirty years old when he came to Leuven during the summer of 1516, a year before Erasmus' arrival in that city.²⁷ The sources suggest that he moved from England to Brabant in order to study Greek, not theology.²⁸ He had obtained, in 1515, a *Bachelor of Divinity* at Cambridge, where he was enrolled in the faculty of theology.²⁹ Much later, in 1531, he attained a doctorate at Oxford. In England he was ordained as a deacon and enjoyed a prebend from Lincoln. His family belonged to Kent's nobility and resided in London, where Edward's father Richard was vice-sheriff in the same parish as Thomas More: St. Stephen Walbrook.³⁰ The good will More showed toward Edward Lee during the polemic with Erasmus seems to tes-

²⁵ Jardine, *Erasmus, Man of Letters*, pp. 111ff.

²⁶ I have strung together a few points in a discussion on Jardine's book in Cecilia Asso, "Erasmus e il paradigma del letterato europeo," *Rivista Storica Italiana*, 109/3 (1997), 1034–55.

²⁷ Henry De Vocht, *History of the Foundation and Rise of the Collegium Trilingue Lovaniense 1517–1550*, 1 (Leuven, 1951–1955), p. 324, note 1.

²⁸ Allen, Ep. 607: 15: "Leus acerrime graecatur"; *Apologia qua respondet duabus invectivis Eduardi Lei*, ed. E. Rummel, in *ASD IX/4*, p. 26, lines 77–78 and Lee, *Apologia*, in Asso, *La Teologia e la grammatica*, Appendix, p. 238.

²⁹ See M. O'Rourke Boyle, "Edward Lee," in *CEBR* 2, pp. 111–12.

³⁰ See D. Kinney's introduction in *The Complete Works of St. Thomas More*, 15, pp. xxxi–xxxiii, and the Introduction to Ep. 48, in Rogers, ed., *The Correspondence of Sir Thomas More*, p. 100.

tify to close relations with his family. Moreover, it is possible that the Joyeuce Lee (or Leight), the dedicatee of More's translation of Giovanni Pico della Mirandola's biography, was Edward's mother, thus creating another link with the Lees.³¹

Edward Lee came in contact with English humanism and its reforming tendencies when he entered the circle surrounding the bishop of Winchester, Richard Foxe (ca. 1448–1528),³² a scholar and an important statesman, who established Corpus Christi College between 1516 and 1517 at Oxford for the purpose of training students of Scripture in the ancient languages.³³ Lee was influenced by the humanism prevalent in Foxe's circle. Indeed he considered himself a man dedicated to the study of languages and of the Sacred Scriptures, as he noted in his own *Apologia*.³⁴ Yet, as we shall see, this inclination did not change his convictions as to the best way of practising theology. Nor did it lessen his loyalty to the scholastic method.

At first, Erasmus expressed his appreciation for Lee's intelligence and his interests. "Placuit ingenium, probavi studium," he wrote.³⁵ Martin Lypsius, a young Augustinian monk loyal to Erasmus, who acted as an intermediary between the two men, described Lee as "vir profecto multi studii,"³⁶ a man of great learning. He retained this reputation in England, where, throughout his life, he was considered a scholar knowledgeable in the ancient languages.³⁷

³¹ See *The Complete Works of St. Thomas More*, 15, pp. xxxi–xxxii, note 6.

³² This is based on an *argumentum* prefaced by Martin Lypsius to Allen, Ep. 912: "Anglus quidam Edoardus cognomento Leus, nobilis genere, e familia Episcopi Wintoniensis." On Foxe see James K. McConica, *English Humanists and Reformation Politics under Henry VIII and Edward VI* (Oxford, 1965); CEBR 2, pp. 46–49.

³³ On the foundation and organization of the Corpus Christi College, see John A. Gee, *The Life and Works of Thomas Lypset. With a Critical Text of the Original Treatises and the Letters* (New Haven and London, 1928), pp. 87–89. Its statutes envisage three chairs in Latin, Greek and Theology. In Allen, Ep. 990: 4–6, Erasmus speaks as if the three sacred languages were taught there, perhaps since, as Allen observed (line 4, note), the study of Hebrew was implied in the study of theology.

³⁴ Asso, *La Teologia e la grammatica*, Appendix, p. 238.

³⁵ *Apologia qua respondet*, in ASD IX/4, p. 26, line 77.

³⁶ Allen, Introduction to Ep. 912. On Martin Lypsius (Maarten Lips, c. 1492–1554 or 1559) see Allen, Introduction to Ep. 750; De Voicht, *History of the Collegium Trilingue Lovaniense*, 3, pp. 71–75; and CEBR 2, pp. 333–34.

³⁷ On this point see the letters by the humanist Roger Ascham (1515–1568) who was his protégé and accomplished erudite work for him, addressed to him once he was Archbishop of York. John A. Giles, ed., *The Whole Works of Roger Ascham*, 1 (London, 1865), pp. 17–19 (Ep. 9), 27–29 (Ep. 13), 31–33 (Ep. 16), and 34–35 (Ep. 18); cf. John S. Brewer, "Passages from the Life of Erasmus," in *English Studies; or Essays in English History and Literature* (London, 1881), p. 374.

Erasmus, by contrast, soon became convinced that Lee had come to Leuven with the specific intent of attacking his edition of the New Testament and the new form of theology of which it was representative. Lee, Erasmus maintained, had expressed his aversion for the Erasmian work already in England, and he established himself as Erasmus' critic at the instigation of certain English monks and of the theologians at Leuven.³⁸ In support of Erasmus' affirmations one may add that there was no cogent reason for Lee to go to Leuven to learn Greek. Indeed, it seems strange that Richard Foxe did not encourage his gifted protégé to attend Corpus Christi College.

Whatever may have been his intentions, Lee arrived in Brabant in 1517 with letters of introductions from English humanists and did not officially make contact with the theological establishment. His contact with Erasmus must have been facilitated by his friendship with men such as Thomas More, Cuthbert Tunstall, Thomas Lupset and Richard Pace, who continued to show solidarity with him even when, following his polemic with Erasmus, he found himself under fire by German humanists.³⁹

Erasmus and Lee became acquainted in July 1517 and initially were on cordial terms.⁴⁰ During this initial period Lee was studying Greek intensely and had begun to familiarize himself with Hebrew.⁴¹ Since there seemed to be mutual good will, Erasmus showed Lee his corrections of the first edition of the New Testament. This would have been done in confidence since the revision was kept secret out of consideration for Johann Froben. The printer wanted to sell the 1,200 copies of the first edition before announcing that a revised and enriched edition would be published.⁴² Although Lee began at once to write corrective notes, ostensibly to help Erasmus with his work, it is uncertain whether he did so on his own initiative or at the request of the humanist. The fact remains that Erasmus initially welcomed Lee's collaboration.⁴³

³⁸ Cf. below, p. 185.

³⁹ Cf. below, pp. 183–85.

⁴⁰ *Apologia qua respondet*, in ASD IX/4, p. 26, lines 73–77.

⁴¹ *Apologia qua respondet*, in ASD IX/4, p. 26, lines 77–78; Ep. 607: 15 and Allen Ep. 906: 450–51.

⁴² *Apologia qua respondet*, in ASD IX/4, p. 24, lines 54–56.

⁴³ See Lee in Asso, *La Teologia e la grammatica*, Appendix, pp. 237–38. Erasmus denies having asked Lee's help in *Apologia qua respondet*, in ASD IX/4, p. 26, lines 84–88. However, in the letter of 15 June 1525 to Noël Beda he writes: "Is there any counsellor to whom I would not have been disposed to listen? I persistently asked for the assistance not only of Ath, Latomus and Dorp, but also of Lee (who, as I later observed, was the

The revision of the *Novum Instrumentum* involved not only scholarly correction, but was also aimed at increasing appreciation for the work in theological circles.⁴⁴ In fact, the modifications that Erasmus made to the 1516 edition reveal his preoccupation to eliminate the passages, which are most offensive to theologians. However, several caustic passages dealing with important doctrinal aspects remained intact.⁴⁵ It is possible that Erasmus underestimated the possibility of being seriously attacked on doctrinal grounds and for this reason only bothered to redress the most obvious improprieties. For the same reason, however, Lee's collaboration did not continue. Urged to indicate the passages to be amended, the young theologian began to note down those that, in his eyes, placed traditional Christian doctrine in peril. Since this involved a field in which Erasmus was unwilling to make concessions, a clash became inevitable.

During the autumn of 1517 Lee continued to send notes to Erasmus. Erasmus responded with brief memoranda, which Lee collected and later published, inserting them in the body of his *Annotationes*. Their correspondence ended around January 1518. According to Erasmus, Lee was irritated by the responses he received to his notes. He showed Martin Lypsius the passages of Erasmus' commentary that, in his opinion, threw doubt on the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity.⁴⁶ A series of irritating episodes led to further tensions in their relationship. In May 1518 Erasmus left for Basel to work on the second edition of the New Testament, declaring that none of Lee's annotations were of any practical use to him.⁴⁷ Lee, conversely, claimed that Erasmus blackened his name at the University of Leuven, that he obtained a number of Lee's annotations and made use of them in his new edition without acknowledging the author's name.⁴⁸ In fact, Erasmus modified many points in

only one of them all who was ignorant in theology), while I was correcting the hasty first edition of the New Testament. It is for this reason that I developed close relations with them, which in the end was to my detriment." Allen, Ep. 1581: 155–60.

⁴⁴ See Allen, Ep. 1225 to Pierre Barbier, 14 August 1521, lines 39–40: "Since I had understood that they [i.e. the theologians of Leuven] were offended above all by the New Testament, I laboured on it for many months correcting it."

⁴⁵ See Asso, *La Teologia e la grammatica*, chapters 2 and 3.

⁴⁶ See Allen, Ep. 886: 59–67. Lee put these critiques in writing in *annotationes* 92 and 93, and in number 11 of the *Novae annotationes*. See Asso, *La Teologia e la grammatica*, chapter 4, pp. 194ff.

⁴⁷ *Apologia qua respondet*, in ASD IX/4, pp. 27–28, lines 99–119, and Allen, Ep. 886: 75–78.

⁴⁸ Asso, *La Teologia e la grammatica*, Appendix, p. 240.

the second edition of his New Testament, which had been annotated by Lee. However, since that edition (March 1519) was published prior to Lee's *Annotationes* (December 1519–February 1520) it is not possible to verify which of the two adversaries spoke the truth.⁴⁹ We know that Lee's *Annotationes* against Erasmus were largely written between autumn 1517 and the first months of 1518, but we do not know anything more of them till their publication. For a year, from the end of 1518 until December 1519, Erasmus hunted after Lee's *Annotationes*. He tried to get hold of them through Martin Lypsus and by writing to common English friends, asking them to convince the young man to transmit his manuscript to him, or to go ahead and print it.⁵⁰ In fact, it seems that the humanist preferred to obtain the manuscript rather than see it in print. He was certainly eager to see the second edition of his New Testament published before Lee's censures became known. After March 1519, moreover, he feared that Lee's edition would arrive while he was immersed in other work, preventing him from responding speedily and adequately.⁵¹ Erasmus' attitude, as documented in his own statements, shows that he considered Lee a dangerous adversary, that he feared the appearance of his critical notes, in spite of voicing contempt for them in public. During 1519, Lee's annotations circulated throughout Leuven, among monks, students, and foreign travellers. They were delivered to the most distinguished exponent of the faculty of theology, the vice-chancellor Jean Briart of Ath. They were also dispatched to England, but they eluded Erasmus, who saw only snatches.⁵²

Meanwhile, a controversy with Latomus⁵³ had opened another front in the hostilities between Erasmus and the Leuven theologians. By the end of February 1519, Briart himself had publicly attacked Erasmus, criticizing his *Encomium matrimonii*, published in August 1518 in Basel. In the *Encomium* Erasmus wrote favourably on the conjugal life and set it above celibacy, contradicting the values transmitted by the medieval Church.⁵⁴ The following month, the publication of the second edi-

⁴⁹ See Rummel, *Erasmus and his Catholic Critics*, 1, pp. 100–101.

⁵⁰ See *Apologia qua respondet*, in ASD IX/4, p. 32, lines 219–20; Allen, Ep. 1026, to Thomas Lupset, 16 October 1519; Ep. 1029, to Cuthbert Tunstall on the same day; Ep. 1030, to John Fisher, 17 October.

⁵¹ *Apologia qua respondet*, in ASD IX/4, p. 32, lines 219–20.

⁵² Allen, Ep. 1139: 18–30. Lee says he sent his own *Annotationes* to Fisher. See Asso, *La Teologia e la grammatica*, Appendix, p. 242.

⁵³ See below, pp. 201–208.

⁵⁴ On the polemic with Briart, see especially, De Vocht, *History of the Collegium Trilingue Lovaniense*, 1, pp. 313–14.

tion of the *Novum Testamentum* provoked a series of sermons against its author in the principal churches of the city by the Carmelite Nicolaas Baechem and the Dominican Vincent Dierckx.⁵⁵ As Erasmus was occupied in defending himself against the theologians' attacks and sought also to silence the unrelenting Lee, Leuven became a battle ground for the proponents of language studies and the proponents of scholasticism. The students came to blows in the streets and a bitter academic conflict among the professors concluded only in March 1520 with the opening of the *Collegium trilingue* at the University.⁵⁶ At the same time, the enthusiasm generated by the foundation of this new institute and the fascination with Erasmus attracted a crowd of students to the city, swelling the ranks of the champions of the *bonae literae*.⁵⁷ Many of them saw in Erasmus' work a way to reform the Church, and the Germans in particular linked it with their own hopes of liberating Germany from Roman tyranny. In the eyes of this heterogeneous group of *clerici*, Erasmus was a key figure who had to be defended from the aggressions of conservative theologians. In March 1519 a young German humanist, Wilhelm Nesen, arrived from Basel with a group of students. He transferred to Leuven to study and give lectures in the city where Erasmus lived. The following year, Nesen organized a letter campaign against Lee among German humanists.⁵⁸ In March of the same year, another scholar, Alaard of Amsterdam, scandalized the University council by advertising a free course on Erasmus' works, most likely the *Ratio*, posting his offer on the door of the Cathedral. When the rector prohibited the course, an uproar ensued.⁵⁹ Last, but not least, Luther's first letter to the humanist, written precisely during that time (March 28, 1519) suggested that Erasmus' polemics with theologians had meaning also for the reformers. In his letter, in fact, Luther clearly associated the cause of the *bonae literae* with the nascent religious movement of which he was the leader.⁶⁰

Not surprisingly therefore, Lee found a receptive audience in convents and among theologians, but once his attacks on Erasmus were

⁵⁵ On the attacks of Baechem see Allen, Ep. 1235: 5–32, and Allen, Ep. 1196 to Vincent Dierckx, March 1521, in which he defended himself against the attacks against him.

⁵⁶ De Vocht, *History of the Collegium Trilingue Lovaniense*, 1, pp. 530–32.

⁵⁷ De Vocht, *History of the Collegium Trilingue Lovaniense*, pp. 314–15.

⁵⁸ De Vocht, *History of the Collegium Trilingue Lovaniense*, pp. 390–94.

⁵⁹ De Vocht, *History of the Collegium Trilingue Lovaniense*, pp. 316–20. On Alard of Amsterdam see also CEBR 1, pp. 19–21.

⁶⁰ Allen, Ep. 993.

printed, he himself became the target of threats and mockery.⁶¹ One day an announcement was posted on the cathedral doors proclaiming the establishment of a chair of “ars sycophantica” (the art of swindling) to be held by Professor Edward Lee, and it seems that a few gullible people went to the booksellers to ask for the syllabus.⁶² All the while Lee received menacing letters in which he was advised not to set foot in Germany or Paris if he held his life dear, and was told that Leuven would not be safe for him either if the young humanist Ulrich von Hutten were to arrive there.⁶³

While publicly denying any responsibility for these threats and actions, Erasmus was well aware of the power and influence he wielded among his supporters. In July he wrote to Lee that he had rather impetuous friends in Germany, who had promised to the Englishman “acriora stilo,” that is, something more drastic than attacks with the pen (meaning blows, “verbera subindicans,” as Lee explained to his readers).⁶⁴ Moreover, a short satirical work published in the early summer of 1519 shows that Erasmus was much more active in stirring up the Germans against Lee and the Leuven theologians than he would have had us believe. The work in question is the *Dialogus sanequam festivus bilinguium ac trilinguium sive de funere Calliopes* (*A Most Amusing Dialogue of the Bilinguals and Trilinguals, or Calliope's Funeral*), published in Paris by Conrad Resch and signed by Conrad Nesen, the younger brother of Wilhelm Nesen, the humanist who had established himself in Leuven in the spring of 1519.⁶⁵ While the attribution of the libellous booklet to Wilhelm rather than to Conrad is uncertain, Erasmus' collaboration in its revision, if not also in its drafting, is demonstrated by Allen with certainty.⁶⁶ This renders its content particularly interesting. Dated February 25 1519, the preface of the *Dialogus* encourages the reader to take it as a carnival

⁶¹ Lee relates that they mocked him in taverns, invited him to learn dialectic from them, and called him “Scotus.” Lee, *Apologia*, in Asso, *La Teologia e la grammatica*, Appendix, p. 238; Erasmus, *Apologia qua respondet*, in ASD IX/4, p. 28, lines 132–33 and 137–41. For Lee being called “Scotus” ironically since he was an Englishman, see Allen, Ep. 993: 16.

⁶² Lee, *Apologia*, in Asso, *La Teologia e la grammatica*, Appendix, pp. 244–45.

⁶³ Lee, *Apologia*, in Asso, *La Teologia e la grammatica*, Appendix, p. 244.

⁶⁴ Allen, Ep. 998: 56–77 and Lee, *Apologia* in Asso, *La Teologia e la grammatica*, Appendix, pp. 448–51. Cf. *Apologia qua respondet*, in ASD IX/4, p. 44, lines 626–28.

⁶⁵ *The Dialogus bilinguium ac trilinguium* is published in Wallace Ferguson, ed., *Erasmi Opuscula, a Supplement to the Opera Omnia* (The Hague, 1933), pp. 191–224.

⁶⁶ See Ferguson's preface in *Erasmi Opuscula*, pp. 198–203; Allen, Ep. 1061, note line 505.

joke.⁶⁷ However, for the persons targeted by it, it must have been difficult to take it lightly. The interlocutors in the dialogue are Mercury, the gossiping God, and three comical characters knowledgeable in the three tongues, desperately poor and obliged to fight continuously against thousands of immortal monsters. Hidden in a cloud, they observe a strange funeral procession. Calliope, the poetic muse, has been condemned for heresy, but this is a mere pretext to eliminate those who have conspired against “istorum tyrannidem,” which is to say the tyranny of the people our characters are observing. In fact, Calliope is going to be buried alive. Grotesque divinities make up the procession accompanying her to the grave. In their midst is their leader, the monstrous Ate, goddess of discord, homonymous with Leuven’s vice-chancellor, Jean Briart of Ath. The features of others marching in the funeral procession bear the unmistakable characteristics of the most illustrious representatives of the faculty of theology: Dorp, Latomus, Baechem, Dierckx. They are viciously caricatured according to their well-known defects: the Gouty, the Squinter, the Lamé, the Swinging. Lee is depicted with a pen stuck behind his ear, a “little god, pallid, starving, with a sad face and a sardonic smile, surrounded by thistles and thorns,” whispering suggestions into each man’s ear.⁶⁸ The spectators observe with horror that he drags a long tail behind him, which contains “Scottish” poison. Lee took considerable offence at this depiction. The insulting image was a well-known joke, and clearly denoted Lee, whom in other works Erasmus had called “Anglus, sive Scotus” (and Englishman or a Scott), no doubt punning on his adherence to the Scotist school. This passage was considered by Lee a defamation, as were two similar mocking allusions in Erasmus’ *Apologia ad Latomum*, published in Antwerp by Thibault,⁶⁹ and in the *Familiarum colloquiorum formulae*, published in Leuven by Martens.⁷⁰

In reply to Erasmus’ challenge, Lee decided in June to publish his notes. However, Martens in Leuven, along with Hillen and Thibault in Antwerp all refused their services. Lee held Erasmus responsible for his failure to find a publisher, claiming that in June and again in

⁶⁷ *Erasmii Opuscula*, p. 205.

⁶⁸ “Deiculus pallidus, macilentus, demisso vultu, risum habens sardonium, totus undique spinis et aculeis obsitus.” *Erasmii Opuscula*, p. 218, lines 322–25.

⁶⁹ c. April 1519, cf. Allen, Ep. 934, notes 1, 3. See LB IX, col. 106A.

⁷⁰ c. November 1519, See *Apologia qua respondet*, in ASD IX/4, pp. 59–60, lines 35–75.

October Erasmus forcibly prevented the printing of his *Annotationes*.⁷¹ In his reply to Lee, Erasmus objects to these claims as nonsensical, given his express desire to see his adversary's notes published. However, as we have already observed, it is probable that he desired above all to get hold of the manuscript. Once Lee delivered the copy to a printer, it would have been easy for a man of Erasmus' authority to obtain it. In any case, Lee succeeded publishing his book only at the end of 1519, thanks to a stratagem. Having spread the rumour of seeking a printer in Bonn, then a small German city, he sent his brother Wilfrid to Paris, where the *Annotationes* finally appeared at Gilles Gourmont's print-shop.⁷² It seems that the operation took place under the protection of Latomus, who counselled Lee to send the *Annotationes* to Noël Beda, the syndic of the faculty of theology, and to ask him to review them before printing. The English theologian's criticism aimed at Erasmus thus spread from the academic community of Leuven to Paris, where a few years later, in a different historical context, it served as a foundation for a much more organised attack on the humanist.

The *Annotationes in Annotationes Novi Testamenti Desiderii Erasmi* by Edward Lee appeared in February 1520.⁷³ It comprises an *Apologia ad diluendas quorundam calumnias*, addressed to the learned men of the University of Leuven,⁷⁴ two series of *Annotationes* in reply to the first two editions of Erasmus' New Testament (1516, 1519), for a total of 268 notes, and finally an apologetic epistle to Erasmus.⁷⁵

As soon as Lee's book was published, Erasmus began writing a response to the two *Apologiae* at the beginning and end of Lee's work. In three days he completed the *Apologia nihil habens neque nasi, neque dentis, neque stomachi, neque unguum qua respondet duabus invectivis Eduardi Lei, nihil*

⁷¹ Lee, *Apologia*, in Asso, *La Teologia e la grammatica*, Appendix, p. 244; Allen, Ep. 1061: 109–16.

⁷² *Apologia qua respondet*, in ASD IX/4, p. 36, lines 364–76; Allen, Ep. 1074: 87–88.

⁷³ Edouardi Leei, *Annotationum libri duo, alter in annotationes prioris editionis Novi Testamenti Desiderii Erasmi, alter in Annotationes posteriorum editionis eiusdem, prostant Parrhisiis in aedibus Egidii Gourmont, sub signo Trium Coronarum in via ad divum Jacobum sitis*. The frontispiece of the volume has the date 1519, but the date of the final letter (1 February 1520) indicates that it was completed the following February.

⁷⁴ It is published in Asso, *La Teologia e la grammatica*, Appendix, pp. 237–49.

⁷⁵ Allen, Ep. 1061.

addo qualibus: ipse iudicato lector, which was printed in March in Antwerp by Michael Hillen and in Cologne by Eucharius Cervicornus.⁷⁶

Erasmus committed more time to his *Responsiones* to Lee's *Annotationes*. They were published for the first time in two separate volumes by Hillen in Antwerp: the first part replied to the criticism concerning the four Gospels of the 1516 edition and appeared in April 1520; the second part replied to the remaining criticism concerning the 1516 edition and the criticism directed at the 1519 edition, and appeared in May 1520.⁷⁷ Immediately after the publication of the latter volume, Erasmus prepared a new printing comprising Lee's *Annotationes* and his own *Responsiones*, excluding any texts referring to the antecedents of the dispute.⁷⁸

Lee's book not only provoked a response from Erasmus, but also unleashed vehement reactions by German humanists. Erasmus' criticism of the scholastics and his promotion of a reform of theological studies had generated much enthusiasm among those who, in Northern Europe, waited impatiently for a reform of the Church and an end to the dependence of the national church on Rome. In Germany, this cause was taken up, above all by the minor nobility, even before Luther began his campaign. The estates expressed their thought with a measure of restraint. In 1520, however, Franz von Sickingen and Ulrich von Hutten, a brilliant propagandist,⁷⁹ began to advocate the use of military force. During that period, the extraordinary admiration Hutten felt for Erasmus and his work led him to believe (mistakenly) that the humanist was willing to put his pen into the service of a revolutionary movement. In the spring of 1520, Erasmus was, in Hutten's eyes, the pride of Germany ("Germaniae decus"). Lee's attack afforded Hutten and other German humanists an opportunity to demonstrate their

⁷⁶ See Allen, Introduction to Ep. 1037; and Allen, Ep. 1072: 4–5. The *Apologia qua respondet* is published in ASD IX/4; on the editions see also *ibid.*, pp. 14–15.

⁷⁷ Erasmus of Rotterdam, *Liber Responsionum quo respondet Annotationibus Eduardi Lei quibus ille locos aliquot taxare conatus est in quatuor Evangeliiis* (Antwerp, April 1520); *idem, Liber alter quo respondet reliquis Annotationibus Eduardi Lei* (Antwerp, May 1520).

⁷⁸ Erasmus of Rotterdam, *Responsio ad Annotationes Eduardi Lei*; Edward Lee, *Annotationes in Novum Testamentum Erasmi* (Basel, May 1520).

⁷⁹ For a full treatment of the problem see Werner Kaegi, "Hutten und Erasmus: Ihre Freundschaft und ihr Streit," *Historische Vierteljahrsschrift* 22 (1924–1925), 200–78 and 461–514.

loyalty and devotion to Erasmus.⁸⁰ Indeed, Edward Lee was the first to write a book explicitly aimed against the *princeps literarum*. For his part, if Erasmus was slow to identify himself with the cause of the German humanists, he did not reject their support and used it as a threat in his confrontations with Lee.⁸¹ In April 1520 he was instrumental in organising the letter campaign against Lee, mentioned earlier. The collection printed in May in Antwerp by Hillen,⁸² and in all probability prepared by Wilhelm Nesen, includes eight letters and is entitled *Epistolae aliquot eruditorum, nunquam antehac excusae, multis nominibus dignae quae legantur a bonis omnibus, quo magis liqueat quanta sit insignis cuiusdam sycophantae virulentia*.⁸³ Roughly a month later, in the first days of June, Hillen edited a reprint, with an *Appendix epistolarum quibus eruditi viri detestantur Edouardi Lei virulentiam* consisting of four additional letters.⁸⁴ Finally in August 1520, the epistles against Lee were published in a definitive third edition prepared perhaps by Erasmus' friends in Basel and England and printed in Basel by Froben. This edition contained 14 further letters,⁸⁵ for a total of 26, and is entitled *Epistolae aliquot eruditorum virorum, ex quibus perspicuum quanta sit Eduardi Lei virulentia*. For our purposes, the most interesting aspect of this collection of letters is

⁸⁰ See the letter to Lee from 21 May 1520, in Eduard Böcking, ed., *Ulrici Hutteni Opera quae reperiri potuerunt omnia*, I (1859–61, repr. Aalen, 1963), p. 346, line 26.

⁸¹ Allen, Ep. 998: 56–77.

⁸² See Allen, Introduction to Ep. 1083, where one finds the complete account of all the editions of the *Epistole eruditorum virorum*; see also Allen, Ep. 1088: 3–7.

⁸³ Allen 4, Introduction to Ep. 1083, p. 200. The eight epistles are: Wolfgang Fabricius Capito to Erasmus (Allen, Ep. 1083); Boniface Amerbach to Erasmus (Allen, Ep. 1084); Thomas Lupset to Lee (published in John A. Gee, *The Life and Works of Thomas Lupset*, Ep. 4, pp. 300–02); Thomas Lupset to Thomas Paynell (ibid., Ep. 5, pp. 303–04); Thomas Lupset to Wilhelm Nesen (ibid., Ep. 6, pp. 305–12); Thomas More to Lee (in Rogers, ed., *The Correspondence of Sir Thomas More*, Ep. 75, pp. 137–54 and *The Complete Works of St. Thomas More*, 15, pp. 152–195); Thomas More to a monk (Rogers, ed., *The Correspondence of Sir Thomas More*, Ep. 83, pp. 165–206, and *The Complete Works of St. Thomas More*, 15, pp. 198–311); Wilhelm Nesen to Thomas Lupset.

⁸⁴ Gerhard Listrius to Beatus Rhenanus (in Adalbert Horawitz, ed., *Der Briefwechsel des Beatus Rhenanus* [Hildesheim, 1966], Ep. 193, pp. 264–65); Ulrich von Hutten to Lee (in *Hutteni Opera*, I, Ep. 166, pp. 346–48); Willibald Pirckheimer to Erasmus (Allen, Ep. 1095); Hermann Busch to Erasmus (Allen, Ep. 1109).

⁸⁵ Hermann of Neuenahr to Erasmus (Allen, Ep. 1078); Erasmus to Thomas Lupset (Allen, Ep. 1054); Thomas More to Lee (in Rogers, ed., *The Correspondence of Sir Thomas More*, Ep. 84, pp. 206–08); Thomas More to Lee (ibid., Ep. 85, pp. 208–12); Richard Pace to Lee; Marquand of Hattstein to John Colet; Richard Pace to Erasmus (Allen, Ep. 1089); Philippus Engentinus to Erasmus (Allen, Ep. 1105); Ulrich Zasius to Beatus Rhenanus (*Der Briefwechsel*, Ep. 168, pp. 229–31); Paul Volz to Martin Dorp (in Henry de Vocht, *Monumenta humanistica lovaniensia* [Leuven, 1934], pp. 381–384); Beatus Rhenanus to Jakob Spiegel (*Der Briefwechsel*, Ep. 140, p. 194); Johannes Sapidus to Lee; Eucharius Henner to Hermann Busch; Hermann Busch to Eucharius Henner.

the presence of nine letters by three of Lee's illustrious compatriots, Thomas More, Thomas Lupset and Richard Pace. These letters are written in a markedly more benign tone than the harsh attacks of the German contributors. More's letter in particular attests to the respect which Lee enjoyed in his home country, both on account of his family and of his personal talents which foreshadowed a brilliant career. Of the four letters which More published in the *Epistolae eruditorum virorum*, three reproach Lee but are written in a calm tone, recalling Lee's good qualities and the friendship ties between their families.⁸⁶ In the fourth letter, however, More takes up the defence of Erasmus more vigorously and unleashes his indignation against an unnamed English monk (the Carthusian John Batmanson).⁸⁷ Composed between July and mid-September 1519, this letter seems to have been written independently of the Lee and Erasmus' controversy. It was supplied by Lupset for the first edition of the pamphlet.⁸⁸ While the letter did not directly link Lee with Batmanson, the Carthusian's criticism of Erasmus' work and More's arguments against them are the same that characterise the Lee-Erasmus controversy.⁸⁹ The letter gives us a glimpse into the monastic environment which, according to Erasmus, had encouraged Lee's hostility even before his departure from England and to which he may have returned upon his homecoming.⁹⁰

Lee's name vanished from Erasmus' correspondence after August 1521, but resurfaced in January 1524, when Erasmus wrote from Basel to Willibald Pirckheimer enquiring about Lee. Pirckheimer had in fact seen Lee in Nürnberg, where the latter had led a diplomatic mission to Ferdinand I on behalf of the King of England. Having become an almoner in 1523, Lee had left for Germany in September of that year with a delegation charged with offering the Emperor's brother, Ferdinand, membership in the Order of the Garter.⁹¹

⁸⁶ Rogers, ed., *The Correspondence of Sir Thomas More*, Epp. 75, 84, 85.

⁸⁷ Rogers, ed., *The Correspondence of Sir Thomas More*, Ep. 83 and *The Complete Works of St. Thomas More*, 15, pp. 198–315 (introduction, pp. xli–xlv). A French translation of this letter has been published by H. Gibaud, with a preface by G. Marc'Hadour, "Réponse à un moine antiérasmien," *Moreana* 27–28 (December 1970), pp. 31–34. See also C.M. Murphy, "An Epistolary Defense of Erasmus: Thomas More and an English Carthusian," in *Acta Conventus Neolatini Turoiensis*, 2 (Paris, 1980), pp. 329–47.

⁸⁸ Allen, Introduction to Ep. 1083.

⁸⁹ Cf. Murphy, "An Epistolary Defense," pp. 333–34.

⁹⁰ See Allen, Ep. 1098: 12 ff; Ep. 1099: 16–18.

⁹¹ Allen, Ep. 1408: 23–24 and note for line 24. His political career did not prevent Lee from pursuing his penchant for censorship. From a letter written by Erasmus we

Lee resumed his attacks on Erasmus a year later when the Parisian and Spanish theologians began their campaigns against Erasmus. Beginning in the spring of 1525, Erasmus confronted a new adversary: Noël Beda, syndic of the faculty of theology, responsible for a condemnation of Erasmus' works in 1527.⁹² Meanwhile, a libellous book signed by "Godefridus Ruysius Taxander" (a pseudonym) and entitled *Apologia in eum librum quem ab anno Erasmus Roterodamus de confessione edidit* was published in Antwerp.⁹³ Both Beda and "Taxander" (Vincentius Theoderici) appealed to the authority of Lee, whom they praised together with Stunica for conducting a saintly battle against Erasmus.⁹⁴ Dedicated to Lee, Taxander's book addresses him in the most honourable terms as a man learned in Greek and Latin, a learned theologian, and almoner of Henry VIII.⁹⁵ The respectful address demonstrates that Lee was no longer an insignificant critic with large ambitions supported only by a few monks. He had become an influential dignitary at the court of Henry VIII.⁹⁶ In November of that year Lee was sent to Spain, where he would remain until 1529, as ambassador to the Emperor.⁹⁷ During this time, as masterfully explained by Marcel Bataillon, imperial politics had embraced the Erasmian ideals—or a semblance of them, as the historian observes. After the defeat of Francis I at Pavia, the Habsburg's consolidation of power welcomed propaganda founded on political universalism and religious unity.⁹⁸ Mercurino Arborio di Gattinara, the Grand Chancellor of Charles V from 1518 until his death in 1530, was

know that, during his stay in Germany, Lee criticized some of Albrecht Dürer's works (Allen, Ep. 1408: 1).

⁹² On Noël Beda and his polemics with Erasmus see the essay by James Farge above, pp. 143–64; Rummel, *Erasmus and his Catholic Critics*, 2, pp. 29–59; and Augustin Renaudet, *Etudes érasmiques (1521–1529)* (Paris, 1939), pp. 240–50, 254–68 and 276–80.

⁹³ *Apologia in eum librum quem ab anno Erasmus Roterodamus de confessione edidit, per Godefridum Ruysium Taxandrum theologum. Eiusdem libellus quo taxatur Delectus ciborum sive liber De carniarum esu ante biennium per Erasmum Roterodamum enixus* (Antwerp, 21 March 1521). On this libel and its attribution see Roland Crahay, "Les Censeurs louvanistes d'Erasmus" in *Scrinium Erasmianum* (Leiden, 1969) 221–49; Allen, Ep. 1571: 65–69 and note 65; 1582 passim; 1603: 36–45; 1606: 20–32 and note; 1621: 31–42; and 1655: 7–12.

⁹⁴ See Allen, Ep. 1579, Beda to Erasmus, lines 96–102.

⁹⁵ "Utraque lingua insigniter erudito et non vulgari theologo Domino Edouardo Laeo, Christianis Anglorum Regi Henrico eius nominis octavo ab eleemosinis Godefridus Ruysius Taxander felicitatem dicit" (*Apologia*, f. Ai recto).

⁹⁶ See Henry de Vocht, ed., *Litterae ad Franciscum Craneveldum* (Leuven, 1928), p. 655, note 31.

⁹⁷ Allen, Ep. 1735, note for line 21.

⁹⁸ Marcel Bataillon, *Erasmus et l'Espagne*, 1 (Geneva, 1991), pp. 243–49.

the principal advocate of the universalist conception of the Empire.⁹⁹ In Gattinara's opinion no one represented the ideals of universalism and religious reform of Charles V's age better than Erasmus. The humanist, however, maintained certain reservations about Gattinara's enthusiasm: his work did not support the political programs of any specific European prince; his cosmopolitanism, moreover, which was indifferent to nationalist sentiments, had little in common with the expansionism of Charles V's Empire. As Bataillon observes, the ties of loyalty which bound Erasmus to the Burgundian dynasty for a long period never made him a courtier.¹⁰⁰ Nevertheless, around 1525 he had many admirers at the imperial court, notably the Grand Chancellor and his learned secretary Alfonso de Valdés.¹⁰¹

Erasmus' status at court rescued him from the attacks of Spanish monks, but put him at a disadvantage in France, where Noël Beda and the faculty of theology at Paris considered him "caesareanus," for Erasmus had declined the offers of the King of France to become one of the royal lecturers.¹⁰² In 1525, while Francis I was Charles' captive in Madrid, the Faculty of Theology of Paris examined and censured Erasmus' works.¹⁰³ Many of the points touched upon by these censures coincided with the arguments and criticism of Lee. What is even more interesting is that Erasmus connected the actions of Beda, the principal author of the Parisian attack, with that of Latomus (Masson), the soul of the opposition in Leuven.¹⁰⁴

Beda and Latomus both received their education at the Collège de Montaigu in Paris. They remained in contact during their respective academic careers in Paris and Leuven. According to Erasmus, it was Latomus who recognized that Lee's attacks against Erasmus could serve the cause of scholasticism and convinced the Englishman to send his *Annotationes* to Paris, where they might be published under the auspices of Beda. Subsequently, he encouraged Beda to continue the attacks on Erasmus.¹⁰⁵

⁹⁹ See J.M. Headley, "Gattinara, Erasmus and the Imperial Configuration of Humanism," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 71 (1980), 64–98; and Idem, "Mercurino Arborio du Gattinara," in *CEBR* 2, pp. 76–80.

¹⁰⁰ Bataillon, *Erasmus et l'Espagne*, 1, pp. 84–87.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 364–431.

¹⁰² See Allen, *Ep.* 1408: 19–21.

¹⁰³ Allen, *Ep.* 1692, note for line 44.

¹⁰⁴ On Masson see the essay in this volume by Marcel Gielis below, pp. 201–208.

¹⁰⁵ Allen, *Ep.* 1804: 210–18.

Given this triangular connection and the fact that Beda held the Englishman in high esteem it is reasonable to hypothesize that Edward Lee stopped in Paris on his way to Spain in 1525 and offered his help and encouragement to the theologians intent on censuring Erasmus' work.¹⁰⁶ At the end of the summer of 1526, rumours began to circulate in Spain about a new "most virulent" book by Lee against Erasmus, written over the course of seven years.¹⁰⁷ He may have put his notes at the disposal of the Spanish monastic orders who, upon the request of the Grand Inquisitor Alfonso Manrique, examined the orthodoxy of Erasmus' doctrines at the conference of Valladolid of 1527.¹⁰⁸ Erasmus escaped an official censure when the conference was prorogued on account of the plague.¹⁰⁹ However, in the 1530s the anti-Erasmian party of Spain regained momentum. The chief promoters of Erasmianism, Gattinara and Alfonso de Valdés, were both dead by then. Lee returned to England in 1529, but left behind an atmosphere that resulted in the Spanish Inquisition taking action against Lutherans and *alumbrados*, and led to the definitive dispersion of the intellectual aristocracy loyal to Erasmus.¹¹⁰

In England a similar situation was about to open doors to Erasmus' old adversary. Richard Foxe died in 1528. In 1531, John Fisher's and Thomas More's refusal to acknowledge the King as the supreme head of the Church sealed their fate. They were decapitated in 1535. Thomas Wolsey, archbishop of York, died in 1530, escaping a death sentence. Two years later Erasmus' last powerful friend, the archbishop of Canterbury, William Warham was buried. "Inimici surriguntur in altum, amici decrescunt," (my enemies are exalted, and the number of my friends diminish) commented Erasmus when he heard that Lee was made archbishop of York. He could only hope that a powerful

¹⁰⁶ In Allen, Ep. 1861 to William Warham, lines 9–14, Erasmus openly declares: "Is quem nosti totius huius tragoedia, et quae mota est Lutetiae, et quae nunc fervet vel furit potius in Hispania autor est."

¹⁰⁷ Cf. above, pp. 83–85. See Allen, Ep. 1744: 125–28 and note 125; Ep. 1747: 76–78; Ep. 1785: 31–34; Ep. 1092: 81–84; Ep. 1903: 1–11; Ep. 1909: 26–29; Ep. 1977: 27–29; Ep. 2094: 37–39. Erika Rummel has demonstrated that Lee actually intended to republish his annotations in Spain (cf. CWE 72, p. xvii, note 34).

¹⁰⁸ See Coroleu above, pp. 85–89. See also Bataillon, *Erasme et l'Espagne*, 1, pp. 266–67. The Spaniards censure against Erasmus are published in M. Aviles, *Erasmus y la Inquisicion, El libelo de Valladolid y la Apologia de Erasmo contro los frailes españoles* (Madrid, 1980). On Lee's influence on the Spanish monks see Allen, Ep. 1735:19–24 and 1861: 9–14.

¹⁰⁹ Bataillon, *Erasme et l'Espagne*, 1, pp. 243–99.

¹¹⁰ Bataillon, *Erasme et l'Espagne*, 1, pp. 465–531.

enemy would be too much burdened with public affairs to bother with personal enmities.¹¹¹

Considering Edward Lee's education and humanistic interests, it is not surprising that his attack on Erasmus is grounded in two fundamental questions: what does it mean to "modify Scripture" and what is the importance of using Greek codices for the exegesis of the New Testament? Many of Lee's *annotationes* commenting on the philological study of the New Testament touch on these two questions. Together, they are the inspiration for the English theologian's works. In fact he hoped to demonstrate that criticism of the Sacred Text is unnatural and absurd and thus make clear that Erasmus' edition was necessarily a matrix of impiety and heresy. Let us look at two of the most significant examples of Lee's argumentation.

Erasmus' treatment of verse 19 of chapter 22 of the *Apocalypse* offered Lee an excellent opportunity to affirm his views concerning the value of Greek texts. Erasmus' edition of the *Apocalypse* was based on a single Greek manuscript. He noted that he was able to find only one codex containing it, which belonged to Johann Reuchlin. Perhaps Erasmus was not as concerned about the text of the *Apocalypse*, since he doubted its authenticity.¹¹² He specified that he published the *Apocalypse* only to provide a complete edition of the traditional canon of the New Testament.¹¹³ These observations may help us to understand Erasmus' sentiments when he realised that a few words were missing at the end of the Greek codex of the *Apocalypse* which were present in the Vulgate. Hypothesising that the omission was a scribal error, he thought it proper to translate them from Latin into Greek, *ne hiaret lacuna*—he says—"so that a lacuna would not remain open in the Greek text."¹¹⁴ Erasmus often pioneered modern methods of textual criticism; in this case, however, he diverged considerably from them. Far from considering the translation of the verse from Latin to Greek a makeshift

¹¹¹ Allen, Ep. 2745: 23–24 and 2892: 95ff.

¹¹² My suggestion does not rest on Erasmus' explicit declarations, but on his manifest indifference towards the *Apocalypse* (in his epistles, for example, he only speaks of it once under the heading, "New Testament. Parts discussed"): "[...] I have completed all the paraphrases on the New Testament, except the *Apocalypse*, which entirely refuses to admit of paraphrases and almost of commentary, supposing that I thought it worth the labour" (To Gerard de la Roche, March 26 1524 in CWE 10, Ep. 1432, p. 206, lines 29–32). See also the considerations of J. Hadot, "La Critique textuelle dans l'édition du Nouveau Testament d'Erasmus," in *Colloquia Erasmiiana Turonensia*, 2 (Paris, 1972), pp. 753–54.

¹¹³ LB IX, col. 246 A–B.

¹¹⁴ LB IX, col. 246 B–C.

solution, Erasmus highlighted it in his commentary of the first edition, and defended it replying to the annotation that Lee wrote about this passage.¹¹⁵ He stated, however, that he would not have dared to take such liberties with the text, had he been dealing with the Gospels or the Epistles.¹¹⁶ In this case, as in others, it seems that Erasmus reserved his most serious effort for the works and passages that he considered of the greatest importance for the Christian doctrine, neglecting the remaining texts. Moreover, in the back of his mind must have been the conviction that few readers were learned or attentive enough to notice defects of this kind in his edition. It is ironic that the only modification to the end of the *Apocalypse* in the third edition is the suppression of the sentence warning the reader of the fact that he had retranslated the Vulgate into Greek—the action criticised by Lee. He left the inserted text in place, and this Erasmian insert then became a part of the Protestant tradition of the *textus receptus*.¹¹⁷

Lee's position is diametrically opposed to Erasmus'. He considered every modification to the Word of God sacrilege and seemingly desired to defend its sacredness by conserving the textual integrity of the Vulgate. In connection with the text added to the *Apocalypse*, he asked why Erasmus did not adopt the same method as in other parts of the New Testament, that is, did not follow the Latin Vulgate rather than the Greek text. Elsewhere, Lee noted, Erasmus eliminated passages from the Vulgate because they were not present in the Greek codices. If the Greek codices were the principal authority for the editor of the New Testament, it was inconsistent to correct them on the basis of the Latin text. Conversely, if Erasmus recognised errors in the Greek text, why did he diminish the authority of the Latin text and favour the Greek? Was it because Erasmus thought that neither the one nor the other was sufficiently authoritative, Lee asked, so that it was necessary to correct the Greek against the Latin and vice versa? By trying to emend both texts and checking one against the other, Erasmus was working on unstable ground, creating such uncertainty that, Lee assures us, no one

¹¹⁵ See Erasmus' *Novum Instrumentum* (Basel, 1516) II, p. 675; LB IX, col. 246 B–C; and Lee, *Annotationes*, pp. 141–42, *annotatio* 243.

¹¹⁶ LB IX, col. 246C: "Et tamen hoc ipsum non eramus ausuri in Evangeliiis quod hic fecimus, ac ne in Epistolis quidem apostolicis."

¹¹⁷ Erasmus' *Novum Testamentum* (Basel, 1519), p. 565 and the accompanying volume of annotations, p. 629; *Novum Testamentum* (Basel, 1522), p. 562 and annotation, pp. 626–27; Bruce Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament. Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration* (Oxford, 1968), p. 100 and note 1.

would subscribe to his choices.¹¹⁸ It was not enough to list the dangers and risks of correcting the Sacred Text, as Erasmus did, Lee continued. Readers might find themselves in the middle of the dangers without realising it—at which point Erasmus' warning would come too late. He insisted that the *antiqua lectio*, even if it did not correspond exactly to the Greek, had never generated heresies, never favoured schisms, and never offered heretics the opportunity to use the text for their slanderous purposes. What is more, due to the assiduous work of scholastic commentators, the content of the Scriptures was now in harmony with the articles of faith.¹¹⁹

Here it becomes clear that Lee is fearful of endangering the authority of an established text and the substitution for it of an individual's analytic and corrective judgement. For Lee the text had been elaborated and handed down by tradition and was sacred precisely in the aspects which Erasmus considers merely contingent and historical. Lee does not negate the value or the authenticity of the Greek text, but he distinguishes it from the Word of God as handed down by the Roman Church “sedulo agentibus interpretibus ut sensus quadraret fidei,” through the sedulous efforts of its exegetes, who squared the meaning with the articles of faith. What is for the philologist a corruption, an alteration and a deformation of the Sacred Word, is for Lee the tradition through which the Word evolved and remained alive. Confronting Erasmus' approach, who regarded the original Greek, albeit a text with variants and lacunae, the only true source of the apostles' teaching, Lee at first reacted with anxiety, but then had no hesitation to bring out the accusation of heresy, convinced that tradition is the guarantor and carrier of the truth.

Erasmus' response, however, is based on faith in an original Christianity which remained intact under the accretions of fifteen centuries of human thoughts and errors. Confident in the daring way in which he handled the impasse at *Ap.* XXII, 19, he responds to Lee's note by referring once again to the principles and criteria of his edition of the New Testament.¹²⁰ He specifies that the authority of the Greek codices is not absolute, but subject to confirmation by the Latin codices, or of trustworthy commentators, either Greek or Latin, namely the Church Fathers, unless “res per se est evidens,” if the matter at hand is clear

¹¹⁸ Lee, *Annotationes*, p. 142.

¹¹⁹ Lee, *Annotationes*, p. 142.

¹²⁰ LB IX, coll. 246 A–247 B.

in itself.¹²¹ This qualification relativizes the statement and makes it ambiguous. Through it, Erasmus creates enough leeway for a personal judgement that allows him to go beyond the resources of the Latin codices and the Church Fathers and to base his decision solely on the reading of the Greek codices. Conversely, he can use the same principle to disregard the authority of the Greek codices, which will be valid only “si...bene habeant,” if they make sense. Erasmus concludes his defense by challenging Lee to point out a single passage in his *Annotationes* that may give rise to schisms and heresies.¹²²

In Lee’s opinion, Erasmus’ handling of I John V, 7, known in the history of biblical criticism as *Comma Iohanneum*, was an example of this danger. It is the only passage in the New Testament, or rather in the Vulgate version of the New Testament, in which the names of the Persons of the Trinity—Father, Son, and Holy Ghost—are cited together. In the Greek codices, however, the crucial verse 7 is missing. Erasmus highlighted the difference between the two traditions in his commentary on the verse. He did not include verse 7 in the Greek text of the first edition or of the second edition of his New Testament, and removed it even from the Latin text of the 1519 edition, ignoring the Vulgate’s authority.¹²³ For three centuries the question of the authenticity of the *Comma Iohanneum* divided New Testament philologists.¹²⁴ This is not the place to discuss the significance of Erasmus’ choice for his theological views on the Trinity. Rather, his choice interests us here from a methodological point of view, for it is diametrically opposed to his choice at the end of the Apocalypse. Furthermore, Lee’s attack on the passage caused a furore, which prompted Erasmus to reinsert the *Comma* in the 1522 edition. Lee’s note on the passage contains the most vehement accusations against the principle of using the authority of the

¹²¹ LB IX, col. 246D.

¹²² LB IX, col. 248 A.

¹²³ See Erika Rummel, *Erasmus’ Annotations on the New Testament: From Philologist to Theologian* (Toronto, 1986), pp. 132–33; and Jerry Bentley, *Humanists and Holy Writ: New Testament Scholarship in the Renaissance* (Princeton, NJ, 1983), pp. 152–53.

¹²⁴ For the history of the discussions on the *Comma Iohanneum* see A. Lemonnyer, “Comma Johannique,” in *Dictionnaire de la Bible. Supplement*, 2 (Paris, 1934), coll. 67–73 (It is not found in the 1926 edition, edited by F. Vigoroux). In H.J. De Jonge, “Erasmus and the Comma Johanneum,” *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 56 (1980), pp. 381–89, one finds (pp. 381–83) a valuable survey of the philological works on the New Testament from the 17th century until today, in which Erasmus is cited in reference to the question of the *Comma Iohanneum*.

Greek codices to establish the sacred text.¹²⁵ Lee argues that the case in question demonstrates clearly to the Christian reader the consequences of taking the evidence of the Greek codices as oracles. How the Arians would rejoice if they were alive today! The Catholics would be accused of having corrupted the Scriptures, and the Greek codices could be cited against them! Furthermore, if such evidence were produced by a man of Erasmus' fame, schism would be inevitable and the Church would regress to the times of the ancient heresies.¹²⁶ People often found novel ideas appealing, especially when they were propagated by a prestigious author. Erasmus was held in such esteem that he enjoyed the confidence of illustrious persons, and his eloquence could persuade even his enemies, thus rendering the disaster inevitable. It would be a grave error for the Church to disregard such controversies, Lee warned. More than 4,000 copies of the Erasmian edition containing the corrupt reading had been disseminated worldwide, to the joy of the heretics. What is more, people preferred it to the traditional text because it was more elegant and refined.¹²⁷ Lee furthermore warned of the printers' thirst for profit. They were watching the trends and the demands of the market place, exploiting and propagating the idea that the Greek codices, which offered different readings from the Vulgate, should be preferred. They issued nothing but Erasmian editions, Lee complained. Learned and ignorant men alike raced to purchase them and jealously guarded their copies.¹²⁸ Erasmus noted with characteristic sarcasm that this was a regrettable situation for Lee, since it made it more difficult for him to publish his own writings.¹²⁹ The church, Lee lamented, was marching blindly into a tragic period of religious discord because of its love for worldly luxury, its shallowness, and indifference.¹³⁰

In Erasmus' reply¹³¹ we find a confirmation of what we have noted about his treatment of the *Apocalypse*. The methodological rigour, which is in abeyance when dealing with texts he considered to be of secondary importance, re-emerges when he deals with passages significant to doctrine. Lee's approach may seem to us incongruent, that is, his advice not to correct the Latin codices against the Greek but rather

¹²⁵ Lee, *Annotationes, nova annotatio* 25, pp. 199–207.

¹²⁶ Lee, *Annotationes, nova annotatio* 25, p. 201.

¹²⁷ Lee, *Annotationes, nova annotatio* 25, pp. 202–3.

¹²⁸ Lee, *Annotationes, nova annotatio* 25, p. 203.

¹²⁹ LB IX, col. 281 D–E.

¹³⁰ Lee, *Annotationes, nova annotatio* 25, pp. 203–4.

¹³¹ LB IX, coll. 275 B–284 B.

to correct the Greek codices against the Latin, but it is not rejected out of hand by Erasmus. In those passages, however, in which the text spoke of elements essential to the faith, Erasmus was inclined to rely on the Greek. “Who ever said that one must trust the Greek codices as if they were oracles?” he replied to Lee.¹³² He conceded that in certain cases the Latin codices were more authoritative, but it was the meaning of the Word of God rather than the words in the manuscript that established authority above all else. If I had found—Erasmus said—a single Greek codex containing the *Comma Iohanneum*, I would certainly have published those lines. Since, however, this was not the case, Erasmus did “the only thing permitted”: he indicated what was missing in the Greek codices (“Quod solum licuit feci, indicavi quid in Graecis codicibus minus esset”).¹³³ We thus find the criteria of textual criticism interwoven with exegetical demands. The two criteria merge in the works of men who certainly are capable of applying strictly rational methods in the search for truth, but for whom truth is identified *a priori* and independent from such methods. In this exemplary case, what separates Lee from Erasmus is the fact that the former relies on tradition for ascertaining the truth, while the latter, disconnecting truth from tradition, yet failing to substitute the rigour of textual criticism, creates a new problem, or rather a problem that had been set aside for centuries and was now confronted anew: How can one maintain a homogeneous and stable theological doctrine without grounding it in a sacred and immutable text? Erasmus is just as aware of this problem as Lee, so much so that he uses his adversary’s arguments to his own advantage. He asks Lee: Do you think that the heretics, confronted with the variants in this passage, could convince themselves that the Catholic version is the correct one? What proof was there, when the texts varied? Moreover, even if the *Comma Iohanneum* were proven to form part of the Scriptures, would the Arians not be able to interpret it in their own way?¹³⁴ Erasmus differs from Lee in his reforming desire to restore the

¹³² LB IX, col. 276 E.

¹³³ LB IX, 275 B–C. Based on this passage it is probable (see also, however, *ibid.*, col. 277B) that Erasmus felt obligated to reinsert the *Comma Iohanneum* in his own text after being referred to a codex which attested to it (although we now know that that codex was a recent manuscript, perhaps fabricated for the purpose at hand). See the different positions of the scholars reviewed in H.J. De Jonge, “Erasmus and the Comma Iohanneum,” pp. 381–89, especially pp. 381–83.

¹³⁴ See LB IX, coll. 275 E, 277 F–278E and *Annotationes in Novum Testamentum* (1522), p. 617. For a detailed analysis of these passages see Asso, *La Teologia e la grammatica*, chapter IV, paragraph 2.

Church and return to a time which for Lee was the tragic century of Arians. For Erasmus, by contrast, it was an intellectually fertile time in which learned men openly discussed their views by the light of faith, in a community free of theological determinations.

My discussion has elucidated the aspects that separated Martin Dorp and Edward Lee, learned men with humanistic aspirations, from Erasmus who wanted to interpret the Scriptures *exclusively* according to historical-linguistic analyses, bypassing the dictates of scholastic doctrinal theology. Dorp and Lee's humanism may be seen as an evolved version of the *sensus literalis* of the medieval tradition, of which Nicolaus of Lyra was greatest representative. However this type of Biblical humanism, if it can be called thus, does not attempt to set up an *alternative* to the dialectical method of the scholastics. Indeed, it yields to tradition in questions of faith. The criticism directed at Erasmus's work on the New Testament highlights the different approach taken by the Dutch humanist, who considered the Scriptures to be the principal and most trustworthy source of revelation. It is this element that made the Erasmian legacy controversial, and indeed scandalous in the eyes of conservative theologians. Founding doctrine exclusively on the historical-philological analysis of the Holy Writ, without regard for the scholastic tradition, and without any theological reflection *a priori*, was considered by them more dangerous for the integrity of the Church than the Lutheran principle of *sola scriptura*.¹³⁵

¹³⁵ It is significant that this radical aspect of the Erasmian exegesis alarmed even Luther. See his letter of 19 October 1516 to Georg Spalatin, in *D. Martin Luthers Werke: Briefwechsel*, 1 (Weimar, 1930), pp. 70–71, where Luther reproaches Erasmus for following Jerome (i.e. historical-linguistic analysis of Scripture rather than any form of theological speculation) and putting aside Augustine (i.e. Scripture read and clarified with theological speculation). Luther draws a connection between Erasmus' and Lyra's work. Both of them—Luther says—privilege the *sensus literalis*, which is sterile and puts in danger *res theologica*: “Ego sane in hoc dissentire ab Erasmo non dubito, quod Augustino in scripturis interpretandis tantum posthabeo Hieronymum quantum ipse Augustinum in omnibus Hieronymo posthabet...quod videam b. Hieronymi velut opera dedita ad historicos sensus incedere...metuo, ne per eandem [i.e. Erasmus's prestige and authority] multi sibi accipiant patrociniū defendendae illius literalis, id est, mortuae intelligentiae, qua plenus est Lyranus commentarius et ferme omnes post Augustinum...pro re theologica et salute fratrum haec facio” (lines 17–23). I discussed an aspect of this complex problem in “Erasmo e il battesimo: materiali di lavoro e spunti di riflessione,” in Adriano Prosperi, ed., *Salvezza delle anime e disciplina dei corpi. Un seminario sulla storia del battesimo* (Pisa, 2006), pp. 255–311 (257–66).

LEUVEN THEOLOGIANS AS OPPONENTS OF ERASMUS AND OF HUMANISTIC THEOLOGY

Marcel Gielis
(trans. by Paul Arblaster)

In 1516 the *Novum Instrumentum* appeared from Johann Froben's press in Basel. It contained the first printed edition of the New Testament to be published in its original language, Greek.¹ The editor was Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam, who also provided a parallel Latin translation, annotations, and three introductory essays, entitled *Paraclesis*, *Methodus*, and *Apologia*, in which he encouraged the reading of Sacred Scripture, set out his views on theology and biblical studies, and justified his own approach as editor-translator of the *Novum Instrumentum*. In 1517 Erasmus moved to Leuven, where he remained until 1521, but he spent the summer of 1518 in Basel preparing Froben's second edition of his New Testament. In November 1518, after his return, he published a separate and much enlarged edition of his *Methodus* with Dirk Martens in Leuven, under the new title *Ratio verae Theologiae*. The second edition of Erasmus' New Testament came out in Basel in 1519.

On the whole, the theologians of Leuven were sceptical of the benefits of Erasmus's style of theologizing, which was not founded on the doctrines of the Church and the exegesis of the scholastics, but on Scripture and the method of textual analysis humanists had developed to study the pagan authors of classical antiquity.² The theologians were inclined to think that the biblical orientation of Erasmian theology could become a source of error and heresy. Notwithstanding these reservations, there are indications that in the autumn of 1517 the theologians accepted Erasmus into the *collegium strictum*, the governing body

¹ Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam, ed., *Novum instrumentum*, introduction by Heinz Holeczek (Stuttgart, 1986); facsimile of: Erasmus, ed., *Novum instrumentum* (Basel, 1516).

² Henri de Jongh, *L'ancienne faculté de théologie de Louvain au premier siècle de son existence: 1432–1540* (Louvain, 1911); Henry de Vocht, *History of the Foundation and the Rise of the Collegium Trilingue Lovaniense* (Louvain, 1951–1955); Marcel Gielis, *Scholastiek en Humanisme. De kritiek van de Leuvense theoloog Jacobus Latomus op de Erasmiaanse theologiehervorming* (Tilburg, 1994).

of their faculty, which in principle was open to doctors of theology resident in Leuven.³

They saw further evidence that Erasmian theology could lead to heresy, when a volume arrived in Leuven at the end of 1518, containing a number of Latin treatises by an Augustinian monk, the still obscure German theologian Martin Luther.⁴ This volume had been brought out late in 1518 by Erasmus' publisher Johann Froben. The theologians of the Leuven faculty scented heresy in a number of the opinions expressed. They took steps to prevent the dissemination of the work, drew the attention of their colleagues on Cologne's faculty of theology to the work, and systematically examined it with a view to condemnation. Froben's publication of a collection of Luther's treatises seriously disrupted the understanding between Erasmus and his colleagues on the Leuven faculty of theology. The latter suspected the humanist of having had a hand in publishing the work during his time in Basel in the summer of 1518, as well as of having penned the elegantly Latinate prefaces.⁵

This was the beginning of a decades-long struggle on two fronts for Leuven's faculty of theology: against Erasmus and humanistic theological innovation and against Luther and other Protestant reformers along with their followers in the Low Countries. This chapter will examine the stance adopted in polemical works written by Leuven theologians against Erasmianism and humanism, but it is unavoidable that this will involve consideration of the struggle against Luther and early Protestantism, as many of them saw this simply as an extreme form of Erasmianism. I will begin by considering at some length the conflicts in 1519. This key year saw three developments: Jacques Masson, effectively on behalf of the faculty, published a fundamental critique of Erasmian innovations in theology; the University of Leuven accepted the *Collegium Trilingue*; and the faculty of theology issued a formal condemnation of some aspects of Luther's theology. Next, I will discuss the later career of Masson, one of the most famous opponents of Luther and the best

³ Edmond J.M. van Eijl, "De theologische faculteit te Leuven in de XV^e en XVI^e eeuw. Organisatie en opleiding," in Edmond J.M. van Eijl, ed., *Facultas S. Theologiae Lovaniensis 1432-1797* (Louvain, 1977), p. 82, note 46; *pace* the dismissive remarks of de Jongh, *Ancienne Faculté*, p. 141.

⁴ Karel Blockx, *De Veroordeling van Maarten Luther door de Theologische Faculteit te Leuven in 1519* (Brussels, 1958).

⁵ In fact, it was the Basel professor of theology, Wolfgang Capito, who had been instrumental in bringing about this edition of Luther's early works.

known of Erasmus' critics at Leuven.⁶ Finally, in a third section, I will treat the theologians from the mendicant orders attached to the faculty in Leuven who spoke or wrote against Erasmus and humanism. One of Erasmus' most important critics, the Franciscan (and later Capuchin) Frans Titelmans, is the subject of a separate chapter.⁷

THE CONFLICTS BETWEEN ERASMUS AND LEUVEN THEOLOGIANS UP TO 1519

Shortly after Erasmus had completed his 1516 edition of the Greek New Testament and had returned to the Low Countries, it came to his attention that certain theologians in Leuven, particularly members of the mendicant orders, viewed his *Novum Instrumentum* with suspicion. The Carmelite Nicolaas Baechem of Egmond, or Nicolaus Egmondanus, was highly critical of it in his sermons. At about the same time rumours circulated that the theologians wanted to subject Erasmus' books to an examination. Perhaps to head off this danger, Erasmus went to Leuven, where on 11 January 1517 he dined at the house of Dorp, as did Jean Briard, acting dean of Sint-Pieters and as vice-chancellor of the university de facto the leader of the faculty. A number of misapprehensions were probably cleared away at the meal, for from that time onwards

⁶ Besides Latomus, noteworthy opponents of Erasmus among the secular clergy connected to the Leuven faculty included Jan Driedoens, or Joannes Driedo, of Turnhout, and Ruard Tapper van Enkhuizen. Driedo, in particular, is not known as a combatant of Erasmian ideas. In his substantial body of writings he mentions the humanist only once. A case can, however, be made that his writings were in reality directed as much against Erasmus and humanist theology as against Luther. See Marcel Gielis, "L'augustinisme anti-érasmien des premiers controversistes de Louvain, Jacques Latomus et Jean Driedo," in Mathijs Lamberigts, ed., *L'augustinisme à l'ancienne Faculté de Théologie de Louvain* (Louvain, 1994), pp. 19–61; Marcel Gielis, "Johannes Driedo. Anwalt der Tradition im Streit mit Humanismus und Reformation," in Martin H. Jung and Peter Walter, eds., *Theologen des 16. Jahrhunderts. Humanismus—Reformation—Katholische Erneuerung* (Darmstadt, 2002), pp. 135–53. On Driedo see, too, the recent study: Wim François, "De onweerlegbare vertolker van de theologie. Johannes Driedo over Schrift, Augustinus en de katholieke traditie (1533)," in Paul van Geest and Hans van Oort, eds., *Augustiniana Neerlandica. Aspecten van Augustinus' spiritualiteit en haar doorwerking* (Louvain, 2005), pp. 427–46. Among the academic lectures of Ruard Tapper one was directed against Erasmus, namely *De necessaria Ecclesiae Christi vetustate, ac quod unum Petrum Christus suae praefecit Ecclesiae Vicarium. Ratio hic ostenditur contra Erasmus Roterodamum*, which has been dated to 1525: see De Jongh, *Ancienne faculté*, p. 183, note 4. Tapper was of the view that Erasmus' *Colloquia* should be banned from use in schools: see De Jongh, *Ancienne faculté*, p. 184, note 4.

⁷ See Paolo Sartori's chapter below, pp. 215–23.

Erasmus lived on good terms with the Leuven theologians. In writing to Dorp he asked him to convey his regards to Briard.⁸ It was in the winter after his move to Leuven that he seems to have been admitted to the theology faculty. Erasmus even acted as a go-between between the court and Briard.⁹ Nevertheless, some Carmelites, including Baechem, and certain Dominicans continued to preach against him.

Before Erasmus left for Basel, at the end of April 1518, to work on the second edition, he asked Briard, Baechem, Masson and Dorp to present an overview of their criticisms of his *Novum Instrumentum* so that he could take them into account. Baechem roundly admitted to not having read it. The other theologians had no comments. A few days before his departure Briard invited Erasmus to a dinner at which Vives and Baechem were also present. Briard again affirmed that he had no problem with Erasmus' works. After travelling back from Basel, Erasmus arrived in Leuven seriously ill. For the duration of his illness he moved in with Dirk Martens. Although he had refused to see anyone, Dorp and Briard visited his sickbed. In his *Ratio*, published in November 1518, Erasmus was fairly positive in his remarks about the faculty of theology in Leuven, which he saw as one of the first to set aside the ingenious rationalizations and redundant debates of scholasticism.¹⁰

But when Briard was asked to mediate in the dispute with Lee at the end of 1518, he came up with all sorts of excuses not to become involved, although according to Erasmus he was not in agreement with Lee.¹¹ In an address on the occasion of the examination of the Carmelite Jan Robijns for the degree of licentiate on 21 February 1519, Briard attacked Erasmus' *Matrimonii encomium*. Leuven's dean named neither author nor book, but everybody recognized the opinions criticized as those of Erasmus. According to Briard, excessive praise of the married state revealed contempt for celibacy. Erasmus explained his position further in an *Apologia*. In the mean time the mediation of Martin Dorp and Gillis van Delft had already led to a reconciliation.

⁸ For Erasmus' earlier controversy with Dorp, see Cecilia Asso's chapter above, pp. 167–74.

⁹ Allen, Ep. 670.

¹⁰ Desiderius Erasmus, *Ratio seu Methodus compendio perveniendi ad veram Theologiam*, in Gerhard B. Winkler, ed., *Ausgewählte Schriften*, 3 (Darmstadt, 1967), pp. 486–88: “hoc studiorum genus... coepit in aliquot iam academiis parcius ac moderatius haberi, velut apud Anglos in Cantabrigiensi, apud Brabantos in Lovaniensi.”

¹¹ For Erasmus' controversy with Lee see above, pp. 174–95.

In all likelihood the cooling of relations between Erasmus and his colleagues was linked with the arrival in Leuven of Froben's volume of Luther's treatises. It is possible that the professors of theology directed the more advanced theology students to examine the writings of Erasmus, while themselves studying Luther's treatises. Erasmus, at least, believed this to be the case, and asked Briard to go through his works with other theologians and make notes of any offensive passages. Briard did so, together with Martin Dorp, Erasmus' only supporter in the faculty. Erasmus responded to their queries with a note of explanation. Briard then asked Erasmus to affirm one last point, namely that auricular confession had been instituted by Christ himself.¹² When Erasmus demonstrated that this was not certain, Briard did not press the point.¹³

In the spring of 1519 a licentiate in theology, then only a few months away from gaining his doctorate, came to the fore as a critic of Erasmus: Jacques Masson, or, in Latinized Greek, Jacobus Latomus.¹⁴ He fastened on a fundamental issue: Erasmus' conception of the practice of theology as set out in the *Ratio*. Masson was a native of Cambron (between Ath and Mons) in Hainaut. Most writers put his date of birth around 1475, probably because it is assumed that he was already a priest when he arrived in Leuven in 1500. Towards the end of the 15th century he had studied arts in Paris, in the Collège de Montaigu, while living in the attached Domus Pauperum founded by Johannes Standonck.¹⁵ In November 1500, Masson arrived in Leuven as a master of arts, together with other "Standonists" from Paris, to get the recently founded Standonckhuis off to a good start. In Leuven, Masson studied theology under the tutelage of Adrian of Utrecht (later Pope Adrian VI). He was already licentiate in theology in 1510, when he entered the academic council as a professor at the faculty of arts. During his theology studies, Masson taught rhetoric in "Het Varken" (The Pig), the hall to which the Standonckhuis was attached. One of his works, a *Quaestio quodlibetica* of the sort responded to in the disputations held every December, probably in this case in 1516, survives from his days

¹² Allen, Ep. 1225: 119–20; "...confessionem hanc, ut nunc exercetur, a Christo fuisse institutam."

¹³ Cf. J.B. Payne, *Erasmus: His Theology of the Sacraments* (Richmond, 1970), pp. 183–85.

¹⁴ Marcel Gielis, 'Latomus, Jacobus', in *Nationaal biografisch woordenboek*, 15 (Brussels, 1996), col. 425–35. See this article for older literature on Latomus.

¹⁵ On Standonck and Montaigu see also Paolo Sartori's chapter below, pp. 215–19.

as a professor of arts. The most important of the questions treated is whether the contemplative or the active life is most appropriate to a prelate. In the 1510s Masson taught two students who would later become well known: Nicolaus Clenardus, an orientalist whose aim was to convert Muslims by peaceful methods, and Frans Titelmans, a Franciscan who later published a number of philosophical and exegetical works and engaged in disputes with Erasmus.

Although he did not have a knowledge of Greek or Hebrew, Masson, then professor of rhetoric at “Het Varken,” was inclined towards humanistic desires for educational renewal, and he maintained friendly relations with Erasmus and other humanists. Masson was not, however, in agreement with the programme for theological innovation that Erasmus had set out in the introductory matter to his New Testament of 1516 and in the *Ratio* of 1518. The same programme was formulated in sharper terms by the Leipzig humanist Petrus Mosellanus in the inaugural lecture for his Greek course, which was printed in August 1518.¹⁶ In his first publication, a *Dialogus* about linguistic scholarship and the study of theology that appeared in March 1519, Masson took issue with Mosellanus, but indirectly also with Erasmus.¹⁷ Masson connected the humanistic desire to make grammar and rhetoric the most important methodological underpinnings of theology with the view that revelation is to be found in Sacred Scripture. Against this he posited that things and concepts precede words¹⁸ and that revelation took place through concepts and not through words,¹⁹ and, in its original form of an abstract concept, is to be found in Sacred Tradition, which thus took priority over Sacred Scripture. Therefore theology could continue without language studies, but not without logic and

¹⁶ Petrus Mosellanus, *Oratio de variarum linguarum cognitione paranda* (Leipzig, 1518); Philipp Horst, ed., *De variarum linguarum cognitione paranda oratio ante annos CXVI. Lipsiae habita & edita* (Leipzig, 1634). See W. François, “The Plea by the Humanist Petrus Mosellanus for a Knowledge of the Three Biblical Languages. A Louvain Perspective,” *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* 98 (2003), 438–81.

¹⁷ Jacobus Latomus, *De trium linguarum et studii theologici ratione dialogus* (Antwerp, 1519); also in Jacobus Latomus, *Opera, quae praecipue adversus horum temporum haereses eruditissime, ac singulari iudicio conscripsit*, ed. Jacobus Latomus junior (Louvain, 1550), fols. 157v–168v; and in F. Pijper, ed., *Bibliotheca reformatoria Neerlandica*, 3 (The Hague, 1905), pp. 41–84. See Gielis, *Scholastiek*.

¹⁸ Latomus, *Opera*, fol. 162 B: “ne linguis nimium tribuat aliquis, [senex] altius repetens dicebat, conceptus esse vocibus priores.”

¹⁹ Latomus, *Opera*, fol. 163 A: “Addebat [senex] in evangelicis quaestionibus ultimam resolutionem esse ad evangelium scriptum in tabulis cordis fidelium [= Sacred Tradition].” Cf. fol. 160 v A: “ne putetur haec [textual criticism] certa et infallibilis regula, sive ultima resolutio, ad veritatem evangelicam pertinere volentium.”

philosophy. Erasmus replied to the *Dialogus* with an *Apologia*, in which through comments on statements by Latomus he argued for the exceptionally great importance of language studies and rhetoric in the practice of the sort of scriptural theology, inspired by the Fathers, that he sought to encourage.²⁰ But he barely touches on Latomus' defence of the Scholastic conception of knowledge or theology.

In the course of the summer of 1519 the theologians of Leuven saw that they had been mistaken in thinking that Erasmus had written the prefatory material in Froben's Lutheran volume. On 13 September they were therefore reconciled with Erasmus. The reconciliation was sealed the following day with a banquet at the home of Nicolas Coppin, doctor of theology and regent of the hall "De Valk" (The Falcon). It was in a relaxed atmosphere that on 20 September 1519 the Theology Faculty, together with the other faculties, in the university council ratified the earlier agreement of 12 July concerning the university's acceptance of the Collegium Trilingue, or Trilingual College, where—in accordance with Erasmus' views—Latin, Greek and Hebrew were to be taught with an eye to the study of classical authors, Sacred Scripture, and Patristic theology.

Yet the peace between Erasmus and the Leuven theologians was soon disturbed again. When Jacob van Hoogstraten, a native of the little town of Hoogstraten in the Kempen and a member of the Cologne faculty of theology, visited Leuven on 12 October 1519 to deliver the text of the Cologne faculty's condemnation of Luther to their colleagues in Leuven, he also brought a copy of Erasmus' letter to Luther of 30 May 1519, that had been printed at Leipzig without the author's knowledge.²¹ The negative remarks about Luther's opponents, the statement that the general impression Luther's books had made on him was good, and the positive remarks about Luther's pupil Jacob Probst, or Jacobus Praepositus, prior of the Antwerp Augustinians,²² seemed to the Leuven theologians to show far too much sympathy for the German reformer. The views expressed in the letter led to a new breach between Erasmus and the theology faculty.

²⁰ Desiderius Erasmus, *Apologia rejiciens quorundam suspiciones ac rumores natos ex dialogo figurato, qui Jacobo Latomo sacrae Theologiae licentiatu inscribitur*, in LB 9, pp. 79–106.

²¹ Allen, Ep. 980.

²² Probst (1486–1562) was compelled to recant his views publicly in 1522. He eventually left the monastery and became a minister in Bremen. From 1534 to 1559 he was superintendent.

On 7 November 1519 the faculty of theology of the University of Leuven formally condemned a number of propositions extracted from Froben's edition of Luther's treatises. Erasmus was not present at the condemnation, which took place in the lower chapter-house (now the sacristy) of Sint-Pieters. Dorp, who had clearly taken Erasmus' side in September 1519 by publishing an address delivered in 1516 in defence of the study of the Bible according to humanistic principles, was also absent because of a journey to Holland. The Leuven theologians censured propositions about temptation and good works, about indulgences and purgatory and the sacraments, in particular confession. On the very day of the condemnation they forwarded their censure to their former teacher and colleague, now bishop of Tortosa and a cardinal, Adrian of Utrecht. In a letter dated 4 December 1519 Adrian expressed his full agreement with the measure they had taken. This letter became the preliminary statement to the Leuven-Cologne condemnations of Luther as printed by Dirk Martens in Leuven in February 1520.

With their condemnation of Luther, the Leuven theologians had taken a clear position in the "causa Lutheri" then beginning to exercise learned opinion. In their view, Luther had proclaimed heretical opinions and could only remain within the bosom of the Church by renouncing them. Despite some disagreements with Luther, Erasmus' humanistic theology meant that he could not share this view. In the final months of 1519 a new element was added to the mistrust with which the Leuven theologians had, despite all reconciliations, long regarded Erasmus' theological innovations: the reprehensibly conciliatory stance that Erasmus adopted towards Luther's heresies, and that was due to a conception of ecclesiastical dogma totally different from their own. This profound difference in attitude towards the "causa Lutheri" meant that from late 1519 a strong alienation developed between Erasmus and the Leuven theologians who had taken part in the condemnation of Luther. This breach only widened with time and would never be bridged. From the end of 1519, Erasmus, perhaps more than Luther himself, faced constant opposition from members of the theology faculty in Leuven.

JACQUES MASSON

On 16 August 1519 Masson, together with Ruard Tapper of Enkhuizen, was awarded the degree of doctor of theology. The costs of his gradu-

ation were met by two students he had been tutoring privately, Robert and Charles de Croy, nephews of the very influential Chièvres, who were to become, respectively, bishop of Cambrai in 1519 and bishop of Tournai in 1524. Masson did not become an ordinary professor, but in 1519 he was accepted into the theology faculty's *collegium strictum*; from 1519 to 1529 he was regent professor. As a newly-minted member of the *collegium strictum*, Masson on 7 November 1519 took part in the condemnation of Luther. He sat on the university's court of appeal in 1519–1520, and was dean of the faculty in 1520–1521, 1526–1527 and 1529, on each occasion sitting either from the end of February to the end of August or from the end of August to the end of February.

The Leuven censure of Luther, proclaimed on 7 November 1519, elicited critical responses from Luther himself, from some of his supporters, and from humanists in the circle of Erasmus, particularly because no reasons were given for condemning the propositions. Masson took it upon himself, first during the vacation lectures of 1520 and then in a treatise issued in May 1521, to give the reasons why the propositions selected had been condemned. In the preface to his *Ratio* he dismisses the Erasmian proposal that the Luther question should be dealt with by a committee of arbitration; this is his first criticism of Erasmus' suggested policy of mediation and conciliation. Of the Lutheran propositions he treats the first, that every good work is sinful, at special length (more than half the book). The *Ratio* also briefly touches on the sacrament of confession, purgatory, and indulgences. Luther's response, *Rationis Latomianae Confutatio*, which appeared in September 1521, contains a refutation of the preface and a discussion of three biblical passages said to support the proposition that every good work is sinful.

In the period from November 1521 to September 1523 Masson was often active on behalf of the imperial inquisition.²³ As theological advisor he took part in the trials of Jacob Probst, the prior of the Antwerp Augustinians; of the Antwerp humanists Cornelius Grapheus and Nicolaus Buscoducensis, respectively city clerk and rector of the city school; of the Antwerp Augustinians, two of whom, Hendrik Voes and Johannes van Essche, were burned at the stake in Brussels on 1 July 1523; of Jean Vigneron and Innocent Servais, who lived at

²³ Gert Gielis, *De Leuvense theologieprofessor en kapitteldeken Nicolas Coppin als inquisiteur-generaal van de Nederlanden (1524–1535)*, unpublished licentiate thesis, Louvain: Katholieke Universiteit, Departement Geschiedenis, 2006.

Nivelles but of whom nothing further is known; and of the Dutch humanists Cornelis Hoen, Guilielmus Gnapheus and Frederik Hondebeke, respectively advocate at the Court of Holland, schoolmaster in The Hague, and schoolmaster in Delft.

In 1525 Masson published a number of lectures, worked up into polemical treatises not so much against Luther as against the humanist reformers associated with Erasmus whose works he had occasion to read during his work for the inquisition. According to the prologue, *De Confessione secreta* is directed against Johannes Oecolampadius' 1521 treatise on confession, *Quod non sit onerosa christianis confessio paradoxon*, and Beatus Rhenanus's *Annotationes* to *De poenitentia* in his 1521 edition of Tertullian. But there were also attacks on opinions Erasmus had expressed in his *Exomologesis*, published in 1524. Masson opposed these authors, who emphasized inner repentance at the expense of confession of sins, by arguing for the necessity and divine institution of auricular confession. In *De quaestionum generibus* Masson quotes word for word from Erasmus' *Spongia adversus aspergines Hutteni* a list of Luther's opinions, for which inquisitors would bring Lutherans to the stake, but which Erasmus saw as paradoxes not touching any article of faith.²⁴ Masson demonstrates that these so-called paradoxes do indeed touch on articles of faith. Those who fail to recognize this, and who would make concessions to Luther to preserve unity, place themselves outside the Church. In the treatise *De Ecclesia*, Masson takes up the cudgels against theologians who would conceive of the Church as the community of all those who possess charity. According to Masson, it is not orthopraxy but orthodoxy that determines whether someone is a member of the Church: sinners belong to the Church, heretics and schismatics do not. Nor is the power of the priesthood dependent on the moral qualities of the priest. Masson justifies at length the hard stance he takes against heretics. In *De ratione obligandi humanae legis*, appended to *De Ecclesia*, he refutes a number of propositions from Gerson's *De vita animae spirituali*, which had inspired Erasmus to write his *Epistola apologetica de esu carnum* of 1522.

Challenged by Oecolampadius in his *Elleboron*, Masson wrote responses to Erasmus' *Apologia* (1519), to Luther's *Confutatio* (1521), and to the

²⁴ Jacobus Latomus, *De quaestionum generibus, quibus ecclesia certat intus et foris*, in Latomus, *Opera*, fol. 86v D. Cf. Desiderius Erasmus, *Spongia adversus aspergines Hutteni*, in ASD 9-1, p. 190: 635-46.

Elleboron itself. The two last *Responsiones* were published in 1526 as appendices to *De Primatu adversus Lutherum*, in which he defended the divine origin of papal primacy against the *Resolutio Lutheriana super propositione sua tercia decima de potestate papae* (1519). In the course of 1525 and 1526 a number of papal and imperial interventions in Erasmus' favour were emasculated by Leuven theologians, not least by Masson, but which did cause Masson to refrain from publishing anything further against Erasmus. Contacts between the opponents of Erasmus at the faculties of theology in Leuven and Paris were at this time being maintained through Noël Beda, a former classmate of Masson's from Montaigu. From the mid 1520s, Masson was spending a lot of time in Cambrai, where he held a canonry and where his friend Clenardus visited him in 1530 and 1531. But he was still teaching in Leuven: in 1526 he commented on the Pauline epistles, and in 1528 he refuted the Protestant treatise *Oeconomica christiana* (1527), a Latin adaptation of the *Summa der godliker Schrifturen* (1523). The lectures on the *Oeconomica* were published in 1530 with the title: *Libellus de fide et operibus*.

In 1535 the theology faculty in Leuven recalled Masson to Leuven for good to succeed Johannes Driedo as ordinary professor. In 1537 he was rector of the university for the faculty of medicine. He tutored Baius. Among his acquaintances and correspondents were Clenardus, the Amsterdam humanists and anti-Protestant polemicists Alardus and Crocus, the Flemish humanist and anti-Lutheran parish priest Levinus Crucius, the Liège inquisitor Thierry Hezius, and the papal nuncio, Girolamo Aleandro.

Masson took part in the trials of the English Bible translator William Tyndale in 1535–1536 and of a Protestant grouping in Leuven in 1542–1543. This involvement produced more writings. The *Confutationum adversus Guilielmum Tindalum libri tres*, on faith, charity, canon law, the sacraments, and papal and episcopal authority, published only after his death in his collected works, was written in response to a now-lost declaration of Tyndale's beliefs written during his imprisonment. The treatise *De quibusdam articulis*, also among his posthumously published works, is probably related to the Leuven heresy trial. The work treats of the intercession of the saints, prayer for the souls in purgatory, the veneration of saints and relics, holy days, and the mass. In 1542–1544 Masson wrote a refutation of Melanchthon's *De ecclesia et de autoritate verbi Dei* (1539), and another of the Protestant opinions expressed at the colloquies held in Regensburg in 1541. Both works were published in 1544 with the title *Duae Epistolae*. A refutation of Erasmus' *De sarcienda*

ecclesiae concordia, in which Masson sets up assent to the integral teaching of the Church as the principle of unity and shows that Erasmus' ecumenical position abandoned this principle with regard to free will, justification, confession, the sacrifice of the mass, feast days and penitential practices, was left unfinished at his death on 29 May 1544.

Shortly before his death Masson had conceived the plan of collecting his works. After his death this plan was carried out by his nephew and namesake, who made corrections on the basis of notes prepared by Masson senior while putting his papers in order. The edition prepared by Jacques Masson junior contained all the works mentioned except the *Duae Epistolae*, as well as an undated and previously unpublished treatise *De matrimonio*, on the indissolubility of marriage. The collected works of Masson came out in 1550 as *Jacobi Latomi opera adversus horum temporum haereses*.

OTHER LEUVEN OPPONENTS OF ERASMUS: THE MENDICANTS
NICOLAAS BAECHEM OF EGMOND, VINCENTIUS THEODERICI OF
HAARLEM, AND EUSTACHIUS VAN ZICHEM

The Carmelite Baechem, or Egmondanus, who had come to the fore as a critic of Erasmus' New Testament in 1516, never really abandoned the fight against humanist theology. In the events surrounding the condemnation of Luther he saw his view confirmed. Baechem was, furthermore, irritated by the letter Erasmus had written to Albert of Brandenburg on 19 October 1519, which had been published by Hutten.²⁵ In his letter, Erasmus had warned against an over-hasty condemnation of Luther and remarked that Baechem had only condemned Luther's opinion of confession because he had failed to understand it. Baechem also took grave offence at a collection of Erasmus' letters, the *Farrago nova epistolarum* (including a letter written to Luther on 30 May 1519), published at Basel in October 1519. The second edition of Erasmus' New Testament in 1519 led to new criticism from Baechem, who in his sermons so raged against Erasmus' translation of the first verse of John's Gospel that Erasmus felt obliged to publish an *Apologia de "In principio erat sermo"* (also aimed at the English Franciscan Standish). Baechem also had the habit of beginning his lectures with prayers for

²⁵ Allen, Ep. 1033.

the conversion of the heretics Erasmus and Luther.²⁶ Concerning the disagreement between Erasmus and Lefèvre d'Étaples, he gave as his opinion that there could never be peace between heretics. In his sermons Baechem always named Erasmus and Luther jointly as heretics,²⁷ including at the book-burning held in Leuven on 8 October 1520 at the request of the papal nuncio, Girolamo Aleandro, who had travelled to the Low Countries to convey the bull *Exsurge* to the recently elected emperor Charles V.²⁸

In 1520 a new opponent of Erasmus emerged in the person of the Dominican Vincent Dierckx or Vincentius Theoderici, doctor of theology since 1517 and a member of the collegium strictum and regent professor since 1519. He too was greatly exercised by the letter to Albert of Brandenburg, in which Erasmus had shown excessive sympathy for Luther and had been very critical of the Dominicans as an order and of their greatest theologian, Thomas Aquinas. In the summer of 1520 there was a conference between Erasmus and Theoderici.²⁹ The latter showed a passage from Erasmus' edition of the New Testament that had been attacked by Standish, namely the annotation to 1 Corinthians 11:24. The Leuven Dominican was fully in agreement with the English Franciscan. Theoderici furthermore criticized the position that Erasmus had taken in the discussion of the immaculate conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary. On this disputed point it is unlikely that Theoderici and Standish were in agreement. Erasmus had followed the great Franciscan theologian, Duns Scotus. Whereas Aquinas had denied this doctrine because it seemed to him to undermine the universality of redemption through Christ, Scotus had posited that Mary's immaculate conception was anticipatory of Christ's redemptive work, and not to be separated from it. (The Church followed Scotus, and thus Erasmus, rather than Aquinas, when the dogma of the Immaculate Conception was proclaimed in 1854!) In general, Theoderici found Erasmus lacking in proper appreciation of Aquinas. He was, furthermore, of the opinion that the great humanist had written immoral books. The conversation

²⁶ Allen, Ep. 1144; see also Ep. 1196: 154.

²⁷ Allen, Ep. 1192.

²⁸ Allen, Ep. 1153; cf. Payne, *Erasmus*, p. 185: according to Egmondanus, Erasmus was, in his *Apologia* to Lee concerning the sacrament of penance, guilty of proclaiming the same error as Luther.

²⁹ Allen, Ep. 1126; see also Epp. 1166 and 1196.

led Erasmus to suspect that Theoderici was investigating the orthodoxy of his writings on behalf of the Dominicans.

During their preaching tour through Holland in 1520, Baechem and Theoderici had met a great deal of resistance, for which they blamed Erasmus' influence. For his part, by the end of 1520 Erasmus felt obliged to appeal to the rector, the theologian Godschalk Rosemondt, against his critics in the mendicant orders; a discussion between Erasmus and Baechem, in the rector's presence, was intended as a reconciliation between the two men but descended into a slanging match.³⁰ On 7 March 1521, the Feast of St Thomas Aquinas, Theoderici had a young Dominican compare and contrast Aquinas and Erasmus, much to the disadvantage of the latter, who protested against this treatment in a letter to his most obstinate enemy.³¹ While spending the summer of 1521 in Anderlecht, Erasmus heard that Baechem had criticized his translation of 1 Corinthians 15:51. The best Greek manuscripts, which Erasmus followed, read "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed" (meaning that those alive at the Second Coming will also be transformed). The translator of the Vulgate, however, had followed the variant "We shall all indeed rise again, but we shall not all be changed." Baechem, however, regarded the text of the Vulgate as beyond reproach. As the bishop's delegate and advisor to the imperial inquisitor, he assisted at Probst's trial and based his accusation of heresy partly on the grounds that Probst followed Erasmus in the textual criticism of 1 Corinthians 15:51. Erasmus took the manuscript of his *Apologia* with him to Basel, where he published it with Froben.

After Erasmus had left the Low Countries, opposition was directed particularly against his remarks on the sacraments and on ecclesial regulations. Thus Baechem criticized the understandings of the sacrament of confession, of fasting, indulgences and vows expressed in the edition of Erasmus' *Colloquia* published in Basel in March 1522.³² After Pope Adrian VI had silenced Erasmus' critics, Baechem passed on his criticisms to another associate of the imperial inquisition, namely Floris Oem van Wijngaarden, who brought out a (no longer extant) pamphlet in Dutch against Erasmus' pacifism and against views he had expressed

³⁰ Allen, Epp. 1162 and 1173.

³¹ Allen, Ep. 1196.

³² Franz Bierlaire, "Le *Libellus Colloquiorum* de mars 1522 et Nicolas Baechem dit Egmondanus," in Joseph Coppens, ed., *Scrinium Erasmi*, 2 (Leiden, 1969), pp. 55–82.

in the *Paraclesis*, where he encouraged the laity to read the bible and criticized monasticism. After Pope Adrian's death Baechem again became an open critic of Erasmus, again targeting his New Testament, and in particular the translation of certain passages from the Gospel of Matthew. The replacement of "dimitte" (dismiss) with "remitte" (remit) in a text as familiar as the Our Father (Mt. 6:12) he regarded as unacceptable. By using "resipiscite" (repent) instead of "poenitentiam agite" (do penance) (Mt. 3:2 and 4:17) Erasmus, in Baechem's view, was undermining the ecclesiastical doctrine of the sacrament of penance. And by writing "tota urbs Hierosolymorum" (the whole city of Jerusalem) instead of "omnis (H)ierosolyma" (all of Jerusalem) Erasmus "fails to admit of the substitution of the general for the particular or of the particular for the general."³³ This remark typifies Baechem's method of textual criticism, which is not historical, philological or literary, but logical or dialectical. In his *Summulae logicales* Petrus Hispanus, after Aristotle the most important writer on logic for the Scholastics, used as an example the sentence "omne animal fuit in archa Noe" (every animal was in Noah's ark), commenting that this sentence is true if the term "animal" stands for the species of animals, but false if it stands for individual animals. It seems that Baechem wanted to retain the same sort of terminology and the same possibilities of substitution for the phrase in the Gospel of Matthew, although it is not clear how a proper noun (Jerusalem) can stand for a species.

Just before his departure from the Low Countries Erasmus had managed to have Theoderici's superiors forbid him from publishing writings attacking humanism. This did not, however, prevent the Dominican theologian from preparing notes for an anti-Erasmian treatise and making these available to his fellow Dominicans. Thus in March 1525 an *Apologia* appeared that particularly opposed Erasmus' *Epistola apologetica de esu carniū* and *Exomologesis*, as Masson was to do a few months later.³⁴ The publication bore the name of Godefridus Ruysius Taxander, a pseudonym disguising three Dominicans who were

³³ Allen, Ep. 1, p. 26: 26–27: "propterea quod in meis non possit esse suppositio pro singulis generum aut pro generibus singulorum"; for a translation see: CWE 9, Ep. 1341A: 1000–02. See too Petrus Hispanus, *Tractatus, called afterwards summulae logicales*, ed. L.M. de Rijk (Assen, 1972), pp. 204–205.

³⁴ Godefridus Ruysius Taxander, *Apologia in eum librum quem ab anno Erasmus Roterodamus de confessione edidit per Godefridum Ruysium, Taxandrum, Theologum. Ejusdem libellus quo taxatur delectus ciborum, sive liber de carniū esu, ante biennium per Erasmus Roterodamum enixus* (Antwerp, 1525).

staying at their order's house in Leuven in 1525. Cornelius van Duiveland, who returned to his native soil a few years later as prior of the Zierikzee house, had drafted the text on the basis of Theoderici's notes and Walter Ruys, later prior of the Nijmegen house, whose surname is included in the pseudonym, gave Cornelius's draft literary and linguistic polish. But the most substantial contributor was Godfried Strijroede, prior of the Dominican house in Leuven and a celebrated pulpit orator, a native of Diest and therefore known as Taxander. The author of the *Apologia* produces an abundance of biblical and patristic places to demonstrate the divine institution and necessity of auricular confession. He combats the position that Erasmus had adopted Gerson's view that infringing an ecclesiastical rule is never a mortal sin. It is remarkable that he repeatedly refers to current events, such as the criticism of Erasmus by Lee (to whom the book is dedicated), the role of Cajetan in the *causa Lutheri*, and the preaching of the prior of the Antwerp Augustinians, Probst.

On 1 July 1525 Erasmus wrote a letter to the Leuven faculty of theology to protest against the attacks of Theoderici and Masson.³⁵ Around the same time, he wrote an apologia against "Taxander," which was, however, to remain unpublished during his lifetime.³⁶ About this time Adrian of Utrecht's former secretary, Thierry van Heeze or Hezius, was in Leuven on behalf of the papal datary Ghiberti to convince Baechem and Theoderici, his fiercest critics, to refrain from further public attacks on Erasmus. But in the course of their talks Hezius came to share the views of the two mendicants.³⁷ Furthermore, like Masson he saw Erasmus' attempts to conciliate the Catholic Church and the Protestants from a neutral middle position between the two as an abandonment of dogma.

In February 1526, Erasmus had his revenge for the *Apologia* by putting into the new edition of the *Colloquia* the dialogue *Funus*, in which the Dominican Vincentius is ridiculed. Shortly afterwards, fate spared Erasmus further trouble with his mendicant critics in Leuven. On 4 August 1526 Theoderici died of dropsy. Baechem was already ailing. He had gone to 's-Hertogenbosch shortly before, on behalf of the chief

³⁵ Allen, Ep. 1582.

³⁶ Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam, *Manifesta Mendacia*, in ASD 9-4, pp. 337-55; illustration on p. 336.

³⁷ Pietro Balan, *Monumenta reformationis lutheranae ex tabulariis secretoribus S. Sedis 1521-1525* (Regensburg, 1884).

inquisitor Nicolas Coppin, and it was rumoured that the Protestants there had poisoned him. Baechem died under somewhat mysterious circumstances in the night of 23–24 August 1526.

A few years later, however, another Dominican took up the torch. In 1530, at the doctoral graduation of the theologian Peter de Corte, an arts professor who was also serving as rector, Eustachius van Zichem delivered a lecture fiercely criticizing Erasmus' theology.³⁸ The next year he published *Erasmi Roterodami canonis quinti interpretatio*, a critical study of the fifth rule of the *Enchiridion*, in which Erasmus had called upon the faithful to rise from the visible to the invisible, that is, to devote themselves to a more internalized piety, in which not rites and ceremonies, but charity and peace were central.³⁹ Completely in accordance with his order's theologian Thomas Aquinas, Eustachius argued that grace, which enables the faithful to live in a state of charity, is communicated by external rituals, namely by the sacraments.

CONCLUSION

Immediately after Erasmus had first published the New Testament in its original language, it became apparent that quite a number of theologians at the University of Leuven had serious reservations about humanist theology. Yet around the time that he established himself in Leuven in 1517 as a councillor to Prince Charles, later Emperor Charles V, Erasmus succeeded in reaching a certain degree of understanding with the theologians, and he was even accepted into the governing body of the faculty. The arrival of Froben's volume of Luther's treatises in the winter of 1518–1519 disturbed this peace. Erasmus' colleagues suspected him of having collaborated on the volume. Early in 1519 Jacobus Latomus, in his *Dialogus*, gave voice to the fundamental objections of most of the Leuven faculty of theology: while Erasmus held that Scripture studied with the methods of historical and literary criticism was the basis of theology, most of the theologians on the faculty took the view that the Tradition of the Church was primary. They conceived of this Tradition as a doctrine expressed in scholastic terms, to be studied with

³⁸ Joseph Coppens, *Eustachius van Zichem en zijn strijdschrift tegen Erasmus* (Amsterdam, 1974).

³⁹ Joseph Coppens, ed., *Eustachius de Zichinis Erasmi Roterodami canonis quinti interpretatio: le dernier écrit louvaniste anti-érasmien* (Brussels, 1975).

the aid of logic and philosophy. In this light, the study of languages and literature was of small use to theologians.

Around the middle of 1519 the theologians realized that they had unjustly suspected Erasmus of collaborating on the Froben volume. They again made peace with the humanist. Yet shortly thereafter the peace was disturbed, when it became apparent that Erasmus was far less radical than they in his rejection of Luther. From the condemnation of Luther in late 1519 onwards, they saw Erasmian theological innovations as a danger to the Church. In his conception of Christianity as living the evangelical commandment of love in the power of an inner received grace, Erasmus came to a somewhat relativistic attitude to dogma, the sacraments and the ritual practices of the Church. Furthermore, he continued to strive for reconciliation with Luther by making concessions on dogma and sacraments. Most of his colleagues in Leuven took great exception to this. Several of them saw Luther as a follower of Erasmus who had simply taken the humanist's "spiritualistic" ideas to their conclusion in open disregard for ecclesial structures (a thorough misapprehension of Luther which continued to dog Catholic theology into the twentieth century). In all likelihood Erasmus was right in lamenting that the Leuven theologians hated him, Erasmus, worse than they hated Luther, or even ten Luthers!

FRANS TITELMANS, THE CONGREGATION OF MONTAIGU, AND BIBLICAL SCHOLARSHIP

Paolo Sartori

In order to sketch a portrait of Frans Titelmans of Hasselt it is necessary to reexamine the main features of the Congregation of Montaignu, which was founded in Paris by Jan Standonck at the end of the fifteenth century. Titelmans in fact received his higher education in the Leuven College of the Congregation. This experience influenced his whole approach to theology, even though he formally left the Congregation of Montaignu when, twenty-one years old, he became a Franciscan minor friar. A couple of years later he faced Erasmus in a short but challenging dispute about New Testament scholarship, which took place between 1527 and 1530.¹

The Paris College of Montaignu had fallen into decay in the late quattrocento. In 1477 Amâtre Chetart, principal of the College, asked Jan Standonck for help with the administration. A young man, aged thirty-four, and fresh from his licence in arts in Paris, Standonck came from Mechelen, midway between Brussels and Antwerp. He had grown up in a very poor family and studied in the schools of the Brethren of Common Life. He enrolled at the University of Leuven, but later moved to Paris, where he had to find employment in order to survive, since he lacked any economic resources. He was employed as a servant in the Abbey of Sainte-Geneviève, which was next to the College of Montaignu. Chetart's offer meant an advancement for Standonck, and when Chetart died in 1483, Standonck succeeded in his place. In a few years' time he revived, restored, and expanded the college. Enrollment increased, and students were subjected to a discipline observed with extreme strictness.² Standonck however was not a mere administrator,

¹ On this controversy see: Paolo Sartori, "La controversia neotestamentaria tra Frans Titelmans ed Erasmo da Rotterdam (1527–1530 ca.). Linee di sviluppo e contenuti," *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 52 (2003), pp. 77–135; Erika Rummel, *Erasmus and his Catholic Critics*, 2 (Nieuwkoop, 1989), pp. 15–22.

² The information mentioned above can be found in Marcel Godet, *La congrégation de Montaignu (1490–1580)* (Paris, 1912), pp. 2–28. More details about Standonck and

but rather a religious reformer. He could not tolerate the corruption of the Church and tried to defeat it in three ways: preaching, creating a religious congregation, and trying to reform the French clergy. First of all he began with intense and forceful preaching against the corrupt clergy, which found favour with several aristocrats and was esteemed by Hendrik van Bergen, bishop of Cambrai, whose territory included Mechelen and Antwerp.³ Next, Standonck reorganised the framework of his college. Montaigu would become a house for poor students. The undertaking was successful, and in 1495 Standonck drafted an iron rule that transformed his students into members of a religious congregation, the Congregation of Montaigu. In 1496 Standonck started to reform the French religious orders by introducing into their houses the statutes of the brethren of the Congregation of Windesheim and with those statutes the ideas of *Devotio Moderna*.⁴

Montaigu's members were expected to counter ecclesiastical corruption by means of a truly poor lifestyle and unobjectionable behaviour. The whole community lived in extreme poverty. Penance and mortification were judged to be necessary to reach the goal. A rigorous lifestyle would make Montaigu's action universally credible. Montaigu's reformation was to be transmitted and disseminated through the preaching of its young graduates. Respect for tradition was essential for Standonck. His own time seemed to him desolate and corrupt.⁵ Therefore, in order to keep the spirit of his community incorruptible and immutable in the future, Standonck needed an external guarantee. For this he relied on the Carthusian order. Their community had never undergone internal reformations because of its perfect organisation and rigorous discipline.⁶ In the eyes of Standonck, the Carthusians would preserve

his reformation project are presented in Augustin Renaudet, "Jean Standonck. Un réformateur catholique avant la Réforme," in Augustine Renaudet, ed., *Humanisme et Renaissance. Dante, Pétrarque, Standonck, Érasme, Lefèvre d'Étaples, Marguerite de Navarre, Rabelais, Guichardin, Giordano Bruno* (Geneva, 1958), pp. 114–61; André Tuilier, *Histoire de l'université de Paris et de la Sorbonne*, 1 (Paris, 1994), pp. 273–77; I. Rodriguez-Grahit, "Ignace de Loyola et le collège de Montaigu. L'influence de Standonck sur Ignace," *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 20 (1958), pp. 388–401.

³ Cf. M. Chartier, "Cambrai," in *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques*, 9 (1949), cc. 547–65, esp. cc. 553 and 561.

⁴ Cf. Renaudet, "Jean Standonck," pp. 137–45, 151–57.

⁵ Cf. Godet, *Montaigu*, pp. 43–58, 143–47, 153–61.

⁶ A famous adage dating back to the XVth century: *Per tria, silentium, solitudinem, visitationem, cartusia permanet in vigore*. Carthusians were therefore renowned for the immutability of their charisma and traditions. Cf. Heinrich Rüthing, "Zum Einfluss

the spirit of his congregation. He therefore put his community under the full authority of the Prior of the Paris Charterhouse, to whom he assigned certain fundamental duties, such as presiding over the election of the *pater pauperum*, i.e. the main authority within the College, and of inspecting at least once a year the community in order to verify that the rule was consistently respected.⁷

Life was hard at Montaigu. Rest and leisure were forbidden. Spare time had to be filled with pious meditations. Sleep hours were limited and broken by the night office, in compliance with the Carthusian tradition. It was necessary for the members to mortify themselves through menial works in the household. The diet never changed during the year: for the main meal small portions of fish and vegetables, the cheapest ones possible, one or two eggs, and a little cheese. The harshest element in the routine was the severe discipline. We know of this from two sources, one offering a positive assessment, the other critical of Standonck. I quote from the first and earliest testimony, supplied by a Canon of Sanct Severin, identified as Guillaume Gregory:

Frequenter regulas visitabat [*scil.* Jan Standonck] et quos discolos notabat verberari faciebat. Quosdam in gravioribus excessibus coram omnibus nudos usque ad sanguinis effusionem caedere faciebat, ut caeteri videntes male agere formidine poenae si non amore iustitiae desisterent.⁸

In 1499 Standonck had to abandon the College after a conflict with King Louis XII about divorce. He was banished and took refuge in the bishopric of Cambrai. He entrusted the leadership of the Paris College to a trustworthy disciple of his, Noël Beda, who thirty years later would censure Erasmus' and Lefèvre's works.⁹ In Cambrai, the bishop helped him to found the first College of Montaigu subordinate to the Paris motherhouse. He instituted another college less than one year later in

der Kartäuserstatuten auf die Windesheimer Konstitutionen," *Ons Geestelijk Erf* 59, nos. 2–3 (1985), pp. 197–210, esp. p. 209; Pierre Debongnie, *Jean Mombaer de Bruxelles, abbé de Livry. Ses écrits et ses réformes* (Leuven, 1928), p. 129.

⁷ Cf. Renaudet, "Jean Standonck," p. 152; Godet, *Montaigu*, pp. 161–64.

⁸ Cf. Guillaume Gregory, *Liber de origine*, MS. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 15049, fol. 21v. See also Godet, *Montaigu*, p. 7. For the identification of the author: Renaudet, *Jean Standonck*, p. 114, note 2. For Erasmus' testimony see: Erasmus Roterodamus, *Ἰχθυοφαγία*, in ASD 1, no. 3, p. 532, lines 1364–76; idem, *De pueris statim ac liberaliter instituendis*, ed. Jean-Claude Margolin, ASD 1, no. 2, pp. 54–56.

⁹ Cf. Renaudet, *Jean Standonck*, p. 149; Godet, *Montaigu*, p. 28. On Beda's polemics with Erasmus and Lefèvre, see above, pp. 130–33, 149–60.

Valenciennes. After the second foundation Standonck travelled to his birth city, Mechelen, where he inaugurated the third subordinate college. Finally he moved to Leuven, where the dean of the Sint-Pieter's Church, the future pope Adrian VI, supplied him with a house where he could accommodate some poor students and introduce the rule of Montaigu. This was later united with one of the four *paedagogia* of Leuven, the *Paedagogium Porci* ("The Pig").¹⁰ The Leuven and Paris colleges had similar features: they both had a residential house joined to a *paedagogium*, where students attended their classes. Moreover, they were both set up in university cities and hosted in consequence a number of students. In 1500 Standonck entrusted Jacques Masson (Latomus) with the guidance of the Leuven house.¹¹ Standonck himself moved back to Paris, thanks to a ruling that ended his exile.¹² In 1502 he obtained official standing for his congregation.¹³ He died in 1504¹⁴ after having nominated Beda as his successor. Although Beda left his post in 1514, he continued living in the College, where he was an *éminence grise*—the *grand maître*, as he called himself.¹⁵ Beda most probably kept in close touch with the Charterhouse of Vauvert, whose Prior he regularly met until 1514, due to the role he had within the Congregation of Montaigu. From 1517 to 1519, the Prior of Vauvert was Pierre Cousturier (Sutor),¹⁶ later stigmatized by Erasmus for his diatribes against biblical scholarship. Sutor assumes supreme importance in this context. In 1525 he published *De tralatione Bibliae*, a long and very sharp essay aimed at defending the Latin Bible in use in the western Church against Erasmus' and Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples' editions of the New Testament. The Bible could not be modified, according to Sutor. Both the Old and the New Testament were *probata, autentica* and *divinitus effecta*. Sutor, with an intransigence of his own, applied to biblical scholarship the principle of Carthusian immutability.

¹⁰ Cf. Godet, *Montaigu*, pp. 29–31, 109–30.

¹¹ Cf. Marcel Gielis, *Scholastiek en Humanisme. De kritiek van de Leuense theoloog Jacobus Latomus op de Erasmusiaanse theologiehervorming* (Tilburg, 1994), pp. 60–61 and above, pp. 197–214; James K. Farge, *Orthodoxy and Reform in Early Reformation France* (Leiden, 1985), p. 249; Godet, *Montaigu*, p. 126.

¹² Cf. Renaudet, *Jean Standonck*, p. 151; Godet, *Montaigu*, pp. 31–32.

¹³ Cf. Godet, *Montaigu*, p. 36; Renaudet, *Jean Standonck*, p. 152.

¹⁴ Cf. Godet, *Montaigu*, p. 42; Renaudet, *Jean Standonck*, p. 159.

¹⁵ Cf. Godet, *Montaigu*, p. 69.

¹⁶ Cf. Farge, *Biographical Register of Paris Doctors of Theology 1500–1536* (Toronto, 1980), p. 120. For Cousturier's battle against the biblical humanists, see above pp. 133–34.

Sutor was a conservative scholar, hostile to humanistic innovations in theology. His views on biblical scholarship reflect those of the religious order, which formed the spiritual guideline of *Devotio Moderna*¹⁷ and of the Congregation of Montaigu. As a consequence, and because of the role played by the Carthusians in Montaigu's daily life, Sutor's *De tralatione Bibliae* assumed high importance for Beda, Latomus, and Titelmans. He was influential, moreover, because of the authority he had over Montaigu as the congregations's highest officer during a period of three years. Nevertheless, the Leuven theologians did not assume in full Sutor's rigid defense of the Bible.

The Standonck community of Leuven was initially under the control of the Paris motherhouse, in compliance with Standonck's instructions. Some years after his death, his successor, Beda, reorganized all the subordinated colleges. They had to respect the spirit of the founder but were free to modify their internal statutes according to their specific needs. This is what happened in Leuven. Some ten years after Standonck's death a new statute tempered, though only slightly, the original rigour.¹⁸ Significant changes were introduced to the curriculum, distinguishing it from Paris. The Paris statutes contained an article censuring lascivious poets and elegant Latin.¹⁹ In Leuven, by contrast, Latin classes at the *Paedagogium Porci* were assigned to Adrianus Barlandus, a humanist and brilliant teacher who was also employed as a Professor at the *Collegium Trilingue Lovaniense*.²⁰ On a pedagogical level things changed as well: the strict and sometimes cruel discipline described above was replaced by more humane relations. For this, we have the testimony of Masson. In his posthumously published apology for the *Dialogus de tribus linguis* we find a reference to the pedagogical

¹⁷ On this topic I refer to: J. Lourdaux, "Kartuizers-Moderne Devoten. Een probleem van afhankelijkheid," *Ons Geestelijk Erf* 37, no. 4 (1963), pp. 402–18; Rütthing, "Zum Einfluss," pp. 197–210.

¹⁸ For example there were 15 fast days less than in Paris, no night office, more grooming and a somewhat better diet. See: Godet *Montaigu*, pp. 59–64; Edward de Maesschalck, *Het Standonckcollege te Leuven. Ontstaan en eerste groei (1500–1536)*, unpublished licence degree dissertation (Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Faculteit Wijsbegeerte en Letteren, 1968), pp. 132–143.

¹⁹ Cf. Godet, *Montaigu*, p. 147.

²⁰ Étienne Daxhelet, *Adrien Barlandus humaniste belge 1486–1538. Sa vie—Son Œuvre—Sa Personnalité* (Leuven, 1938), pp. 6–16; Henry de Vocht, *History of the Foundation and Rise of the Collegium Trilingue Lovaniense 1517–1550*, 1 (Leuven, 1951–1955), pp. 226–31.

importance of moderation,²¹ a moderation he himself introduced into the hard spiritual discipline of Montaigne.

This principle was internalized by his disciples and adopted by Frans Titelmans in his apology of the traditional New Testament. Titelmans was the last critic of Erasmus' biblical philology belonging to the congregation of Montaigne. He was born in Hasselt probably in 1502 and entered the congregation as a poor orphan aged 15. He was a resident member only until he obtained his licence of Arts in 1521,²² but followed Montaigne's spirituality until he died. In 1523 he entered the Franciscan Order. He obeyed Standonck's precept to preach not from church pulpits but from the lectern at the Franciscan *studium* in Leuven.²³ He was a very capable teacher and clear exegete, and he published several books in a few years. Two of his volumes were reprinted several times each during the sixteenth century and were translated into different languages.²⁴ During the first two years he spent at the College of Montaigne, Titelmans formed a close personal relationship with Masson based on the ideal of moderation, which they shared. We can infer this from reading the prologue to 'Titelmans' *Collationes quinque*, a commentary in the form of a dialogue on the epistle to the Romans. It was published in 1529 and forms part of a debate with Erasmus and Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples.²⁵ Ironically, Titelmans was in a sense an Erasmian: he likely studied all three biblical languages,²⁶ he accepted the philological method defended by Erasmus, and he intended his scholarly contribution for private and not for official use in the Church.²⁷ There are, however, some elements that clearly place

²¹ See Iacobus Latomus, *Pro Dialogo de Tribus Linguis Apologia*, in *Iacobi Latomi Sacrae Theologiae apud Lovanienses Professoris Celeberrimi Opera* (Leuven, 1550), fols. 169r–171r, esp. fol. 169v B. On the *ne quid nimis* pedagogy I refer to: Paolo Sartori, "Tracce dell'opera di Iacobus Latomus nel Prologus apologeticus di Frans Titelmans," in F. Forner, C.M. Monti, and P.G. Schmidt, eds., *Margarita amicorum. Studi di cultura europea per Agostino Sottili*, 2 (Milan, 2005), pp. 1031–42, esp. p. 1041.

²² Alfons Paquay, *Frans Tittelmans van Hasselt. Opzoekingen over zijn leven, zijne werken en zijne familie* (Hasselt, 1906), pp. 26–28, 36–39; Edmond Henri Joseph Reusens, *Promotions de la Faculté des Arts de l'Université de Leuven (1428–1797)* (Leuven, 1869), p. 72.

²³ Cf. Paquay, *Frans Tittelmans*, pp. 38, 40.

²⁴ Cf. Sartori, "La controversia," p. 87.

²⁵ Cf. Sartori, "Tracce," pp. 1035–42.

²⁶ Official evidence of his knowledge of Hebrew is still lacking. An indirect proof can be deduced from Max Engammare, *Qu'il me baise des baisers de sa bouche'. Le Cantique des Cantiques à la Renaissance. Étude et bibliographie* (Geneva, 1993), pp. 211–14, 243–45, 270–73.

²⁷ Cf. Sartori, "La controversia," pp. 113–20.

Titelmans among the conservative theologians, for example his apology of the flawed and pedestrian style of the Bible and his defense of the immutability of Holy Scripture. Both topics must be examined from a spiritual point of view. Titelmans, one must remember, embraced a life of poverty and sacrifice at Montaigu and aimed at exemplifying the Gospel in his life as much as possible. His intentions are manifested in his adherence to the ideals of poverty and humility both in life and in literary style. Also noteworthy are the spiritual readings he perused daily, in particular the *De imitatione Christi*, which recommended searching for God rather than for eloquence in the Holy Scripture.²⁸ It was therefore impossible for Titelmans to accept the idea of improving the literary style of the Bible and making it more elegant. Even Erasmus felt compelled to respect balance and moderation in his revisions to avoid introducing theological problems due to unnecessary stylistical changes. Humanistic eloquence had dignity in the eyes of Titelmans, but it was the fruit of human erudition and should not prevail over the spare style of the New Testament, which was chosen and inspired by God. He therefore trisected eloquence, arranging it on three hierarchical levels: the lowest was occupied by redundant and artificial eloquence, an end itself. In the middle, showing balance, *ne quid nimis*, he set refined humanist eloquence. On the top rung he placed the lowly eloquence of the New Testament, so precious because God himself had chosen it in order to communicate with mankind and so attractive that even Cyprian and Jerome, both masters of Latinity, fell in love with it.²⁹ Titelmans contended, moreover, that God continuously looked out for the holy text, in order to keep it intact and truthful. If the Latin New Testament was no longer reliable, God would find a way to protect his message. He might look for another people through which to transmit His Word and His Church, as he did in the past when the Jews and Greeks proved to be unfaithful and schismatic.³⁰

²⁸ See Tiburzio Lupo, ed., *De imitatione Christi libri quatuor*, 1 (Vatican City, 1982), pp. 5, 1–4 and 10–11: “Veritas est in Scripturis Sanctis quaerenda, non eloquentia. Omnis Scriptura sacra Sancto eo Spiritu debet legi, quo facta est. Quaerere debemus potius utilitatem in Scripturis, quam subtilitatem sermonis. Ita devotos et simplices libros legere debemus, sicut altos et profundos. [...] Si vis profectum haurire, lege humiliter, simpliciter et fideliter, nec unquam velis habere nomen scientiae. Interroga libenter et audi tacens verba Sanctorum, nec displiceant tibi parabolae seniorum: sine causa enim non proferuntur.”

²⁹ Cf. Sartori, “La controversia,” pp. 124–32.

³⁰ Cf. Sartori, “La controversia,” pp. 90–93.

Ne quid nimis must be respected even when collating manuscripts: collation of the original texts was fruitful and good, he said, but could not be imposed if one was unable to show absolute and scientific evidence of the reliability of the manuscripts themselves. To do so in the absence of such evidence would be excessive.³¹

For Titelmans, the Bible is immutable, its integrity guarded by the uninterrupted and watchful presence of God in human history. It is in this sense that Titelmans inherits the Carthusian idea of immutability as handed down by Sutor. There are several traces of Sutor's influence in Titelmans' *Collationes quinque*, such as the structure of the work, its motive, and some indirect quotations.³² Titelmans, however, follows the moderate *ne quid nimis* spirituality, rejecting Sutor's fiery tone and his refusal of the study of biblical languages and of the collation of Latin and Greek manuscripts.

In his approach to spirituality Titelmans differed from Standonck as well: he looked back in time to defend the tradition in which he was deeply rooted, but for a long time he also looked forward towards a theology that was at least partly influenced by Erasmus. At a certain point of his life, however, he returned to the original ideals of Montaigu. He may have sensed that the goal of his scholarly activity, namely to keep Christians united by defending the unity of their Bible, was threatened by the Protestant reformation. He abandoned his teaching and what he saw as superfluous culture and looked for a way to be "the least" in a religious sense, that is, to live without possessions, indeed without books. He left Leuven and travelled to Rome. There he entered the new Capuchin order, whose goal was to lead an authentic Christian life through strict respect for the original Franciscan rule.³³ In Rome Titelmans adopted a lifestyle which was very similar to the one of Standonck's Montaigu: extreme poverty, very limited nourishment, permanent abstinence from meat, uninterrupted labour, and menial

³¹ Cf. Sartori, "La controversia," pp. 113–20.

³² The subject is too large to be discussed in detail here, but to give an example: the two men had a similar view about the anonymous author of the Latin version of New Testament which was reviewed by Jerome. Cf. Sartori, "La controversia," pp. 107–08, note 89.

³³ On the rise of the Capuchin order see: Elisabeth G. Gleason, "The Capuchin Order in the sixteenth century," *Greyfriars Review* 16 (2002), pp. 203–26; Claude-Charles Billot, *Les Capucins. Une réforme franciscaine au XVI^e siècle* (Nantes, 2001); Mariano D'Alatri, *I Cappuccini: storia d'una famiglia francescana* (Roma, 1994); Costanzo Cargnoni, *I Frati Cappuccini: documenti e testimonianze del primo secolo* (Perugia, 1988–1993).

work in an hospital. This lifestyle led to his untimely death, two years later, on 12 September 1537.³⁴

Titelmans' life affords us an example of the intricate interplay between conservative spirituality and biblical humanism. We can trace it in the scholarly productions of Titelmans and also in those of his contemporaries, a subject that merits further investigation. A different, though equally strong, spirituality drove Erasmus' New Testament scholarship. Erasmus, too, defended the immutability of the Bible but in a different way: philology, that is, human erudition, was to preserve the text or rediscover the original Scripture God revealed to mankind, which had been spoiled or hidden by textual corruption. Platonism and Christian humanism are the underlying elements of this spirituality, as Cecilia Asso has noted about Erasmus' controversy with Edward Lee.³⁵

Despite their common cultural background—Erasmus, too, was a disciple of the *Devotio Moderna*—Erasmus could not reconcile his approach with Titelmans' or with the ideas taught at Montaigu. Titelmans, by contrast, seems to have seen common ground between conservative spirituality and biblical humanism, which makes him one of the more interesting figures among the critics of Erasmus and invites a new philological and historical study of his numerous, but to some extent neglected, works.

³⁴ Cf. Paquay, *Frans Tittelmans*, pp. 93–96; Benjamin de Troeyer, *Bio-bibliographia franciscana neerlandica ante saeculum XVI* 1 (Nieuwkoop, 1974), pp. 91–93.

³⁵ Cf. Cecilia Asso, *La teologia e la grammatica. La controversia tra Erasmo ed Edward Lee* (Firenze, 1993), pp. 65–67 and above, pp. 167–96.

CRITICS OF BIBLICAL HUMANISM IN
SIXTEENTH-CENTURY ITALY

ITALIAN BIBLICAL HUMANISM AND THE PAPACY, 1515–1535

Paul F. Grendler

A half dozen dedicated and highly productive Italian biblical humanists published major works of biblical exegesis in the years of the pontificates of Leo X (1513–21), Adrian VI (1522–23), and Clement VII (1523–34).¹ They came to biblical scholarship from different directions and followed diverse career paths. Some were Christian Hebraists who worked alone and in relative obscurity. Two were prominent curial cardinals very active in papal religious politics in the early years of the Reformation. The majority of the biblical humanists were members of monastic orders rooted in medieval scholastic theology and philosophy. Nevertheless, they rejected the medieval scholastic learning of their orders in favor of the humanistic *ad fontes* approach. They studied and edited Scripture in its original languages. All became convinced that the Vulgate had to be corrected. So they produced new translations and polyglot editions of the Bible or individual books, especially the Psalms. Consequently, almost all of the Italian biblical humanists were attacked by conservative theologians.

All six of the Italian biblical humanists discussed below lived and worked in Rome for much or part of their lives and had some contact with popes. They sought and sometimes received papal financial support enabling them to publish their works. Clement VII rallied to the defense of two of the Italian biblical humanists when they were attacked by the Faculty of Theology of the University of Paris. But papal support was individual and sporadic and never developed into

¹ Italian biblical humanism has not received the scholarly attention that it merits, despite excellent studies on individual figures, probably because of the extraordinary linguistic expertise required and the difficulty in locating some of the works, at least in North America. So far as can be determined, this is the first attempt to survey Italian biblical humanism as a whole for these years; perhaps it will encourage further study. It is a pleasure to thank those who have helped. My greatest debt is to Nelson Minnich who read an earlier draft and provided photocopies and bibliography. Erika Rummel also corrected errors and gave good advice. James K. Farge provided photocopies and examined books unavailable to me; Benjamin Ravid cheerfully answered questions; and Max Engammare provided me with offprints. Several librarians were also helpful. I am grateful to all.

a continuing or institutional program of biblical humanism. Four of the six biblical humanists spent much of their lives in France because of what they saw as limited opportunity to bring their scholarship to fruition in Italy and the wars that disrupted their lives.

1. FOUR CHRISTIAN HEBRAISTS

The first was Fra Felice da Prato (c. 1460–1559).² From a Tuscan Jewish banking family and possibly the son of a rabbi, Fra Felice probably also trained as a rabbi. He left Judaism to become a Christian when he was over forty, perhaps in April 1505, and was an Augustinian Hermit by 1506. He had some Catholic theological training and may have studied at the University of Padua. At an unknown date he went to Rome and probably taught theology there, because the papal privilege of 1515 for his *Psalterium ex Hebreo* (see below) called him a “public professor” (*professor ad publicam*). It is most likely that he taught in the Augustinian convent in Rome; whether he taught Hebrew is unclear. From about 1515 to about 1518 he taught Hebrew in Venice, where Daniel Bomberg (c. 1483–1553), a Christian from the Netherlands who became the most important publisher of Hebrew books in the Renaissance, was his pupil.

Fra Felice’s first biblical work was a Latin translation and limited commentary on the Psalms based on the Hebrew text: *Psalterium ex Hebreo diligentissime ad verbum fere tralatam: fratre Felice ordinis Heremitarum sancti Augustini interprete per summum pontificem Leonem Decimum approbatum* (Venetiis: excussum in edibus Petri Liechtenstein impressoris, impensis ac sumptibus Danielis Bombergi, 1515), in quarto. The colophon adds the precise date of 5 September 1515.³ In his undated dedicatory letter to Pope Leo X, Fra Felice explained that after he had been in Rome for four months, two cardinals, the prominent Bernardino Lopez de Carvajal (1456–1523), and the lesser Marco Corner (1482–1524), asked

² For Fra Felice’s life and further bibliography, see Rosalba Zangari, “Felice da Prato,” in *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, 46 (Rome, 1960–), pp. 42–44 (hereafter DBI); Paul Kahle, “Zwei durch Humanisten besorgte, dem Papst gewidmete Ausgaben der hebräischen Bibel,” in Paul Kahle ed., *Opera minora* (Leiden, 1956), pp. 130–35 (entire article pp. 128–50); the brief comments of Shlomo Simonsohn, *The Apostolic See and the Jews: History* (Toronto, 1991), pp. 283, 285; and Marco Bernuzzi, “Felice da Prato,” in CEBR 2, p. 15.

³ The New York Public Library copy has been examined.

him to translate the Psalms from Hebrew into Latin, and he willingly did so.⁴ He also mentioned encouragement from Pietro Bembo, the pope's secretary. Fra Felice reminded the pontiff that he was a fellow Tuscan who was happy to be under the pope's protection. He recalled how he had been born into Jewish perversity (*pravitas*). But inflamed by love of the Christian faith, he had been baptized at the church of St. Stephen in Prato. He hoped that his translation of the poetry of the prophet (i.e., David) would help to clarify and spread knowledge of the mystery of the Christian religion.

Fra Felice continued this theme in his letter to the reader. He acknowledged that the Psalms as translated by Jerome, a most learned man, had been printed. But he hoped that his own work bringing forth the meaning (*sensum*) and rendering the rhetorical figures (*figurae*) of the prophet and poet into a common language would help men to understand them. Although Hebrew was a most elegant language, it could also be rendered well into Latin. He informed the reader that he had sometimes changed singular to plural and altered tenses. The volume also contained a papal printing privilege of ten years granted to Fra Felice, described as a "public professor" and as especially learned in theology. Dated 10 October 1515 and signed by Bembo, the privilege was valid for the papal state and beyond, with violators threatened with excommunication.⁵

Printing privileges did not stop other publishers from reprinting a book, because no state could enforce a privilege beyond its own borders. Moreover, excommunication was such a heavy a penalty for such a

⁴ "cum quantum ab hinc mensem Romae agerem & Reverendissimus atque ideoque nobilissimus sanctis Crucis & Corneliorum familiae fulgentissimum lumen Cardinales psalmorum translationem ex hebreo in latinum idioma a me peterent: recusare nequaquam volui." Felice da Prato, *Psalterium ex Hebreo* (Venice, 1515), dedicatory letter to Leo X on the verso of the title page, no signature. Carvajal, from Estramadura, was raised to the cardinalate in 1493 and served several popes as a diplomat, although not always to their satisfaction. He had a doctorate in theology and published a number of works, mostly orations. He was called Cardinal Santa Croce because his titular church was Santa Croce in Gerusalemme. Gigliola Fragnito, "Carvajal, Bernardino Lopez de," in DBI 21, pp. 28–34. Corner (or Cornaro) studied at the University of Padua, and became a cardinal in 1500. He also served the papacy as a legate and diplomat and harvested lucrative bishoprics and benefices in the Venetian state. Giuseppe Gullino, "Corner, Marco," in DBI 29, pp. 255–57. Neither is known to have had strong biblical interests.

⁵ Felice da Prato, *Psalterium ex Hebreo*, letter to the editor and printing privilege, no signatures. The printing privilege is also found in Kahle, "Zwei Ausgaben der Hebräischen Bibel," p. 131; and Shlomo Simonsohn, *The Apostolic See and the Jews. Documents: 1464–1521* (Toronto, 1990), pp. 1563–64 (document 1247).

minor offence that it was never levied, so far as is known. Hence, Fra Felice's *Psalterium ex Hebreo* was reprinted in Venice 1519, Basel 1524, and Lyon 1530. But the printing privilege did convey papal approval which readers might interpret as they wished. The combination of dedicatory letter to the pope noting their common Tuscan roots and papal privilege indicates that the papacy had some knowledge of Fra Felice's biblical scholarship and approved, or at least did not object to being associated with it. In addition, the invocation of two cardinals and an influential papal secretary underscored Fra Felice's Roman connections.

The *Psalterium ex Hebreo* is a lean work of 128 pages printed in a semi-gothic typeface in a small quarto format.⁶ It presents a Latin translation of each psalm in the middle of the page. Small superscript numbers, like modern footnote numbers, refer the reader to numbered notes in the margins. These give alternative Latin words and phrases in smaller type. Sometimes Fra Felice lists Hebrew words in the right margin as well. After the Latin translation and variants for each psalm are given, Fra Felice offers his commentary. It is primarily grammatical, with comments on the case, number, and gender of words, plus punctuation, but with little detail. Fra Felice mentions Jerome only once and does not criticize his translation. He supports his translation choices with frequent references to unnamed Hebrew authors (*apud hebreorum auctores* or *plerumque testibus auctoribus hebreorum*), undoubtedly medieval Jewish commentators on the Psalms. Fra Felice also refers generically to the Hebrew text of the Old Testament (*Hebraica veritas*) and to the Chaldean text (*chaldaica expositio*), meaning the Targum, that is, the Aramaic paraphrase of the Old Testament, excluding the books of Nehemiah, Ezra, and Daniel, prepared in the ancient world. He occasionally refers to the Greek Septuagint.⁷

⁶ For this and the following paragraph, see Felice da Prato, *Psalterium ex Hebreo*, passim. There are numerous references to Hebrew authors, the Chaldean text, the Christian message of David, and so on.

⁷ The Septuagint is the Greek text of the Bible prepared in Egypt in the second century from a pre-Masoretic Hebrew text; it was adopted by the Christian community. According to the legend of its preparation, seventy elders, each working alone in his cell, produced the same Greek translation, which was taken to be evidence that the translation was inspired by the Holy Spirit. Origen did additional critical work on the text in the third century, and another version used in the Greek Church appeared in the ninth century.

The second theme of his commentary is a relentless Christian messianic interpretation of the Psalms. Fra Felice frequently points out how the words of David, “the prophet,” signify the mystery of Christ, that David describes Christ’s persecution, passion, and victory (in Psalm 22, for example), and that “we” understand the Christian meaning of passages. In Psalm 8 Fra Felice explains that the Philistines represent the Gentiles and that David the prophet writes that all peoples will be converted to the Christian faith. Fra Felice delivered a stronger Christian messianic interpretation than some Italian Psalm commentators who were born Catholic. Fra Felice makes a handful of references to other passages in the Old Testament but none to the New Testament. And except for a passing reference to Jerome, he never refers to other Christian authors, not even the Greek and Latin Fathers. After Psalm 55, Fra Felice practically abandons his commentary and limits himself to giving variant translations.

Fra Felice’s next publications were much larger and significant. He edited two versions of the Hebrew Old Testament, both published by Daniel Bomberg in Venice, 1517. The first was the first polyglot printing of the Hebrew Bible with Hebrew commentary, a work of historic importance.⁸ It was a folio-sized four-volume polyglot Hebrew Old Testament with additional material. Each page presents the Hebrew text, the Targum, comments by medieval Jewish scholars, and the Masoretic notes. The Masora was the accumulation of notes on the Old Testament compiled by Jewish scribes in the tenth century. The Bible also included commentary by the distinguished medieval Jewish biblical scholars Rashi (Rabbi Solomon Ben Isaac, 1040–1105), David Kimhi (1160–1235), Nahmanides (Moses ben Nahman, c. 1195–c. 1270), and others. In short, it was a comprehensive rabbinical Bible. The second work of 1517 was a one-volume quarto edition of the Hebrew Old Testament without additional material. Fra Felice dedicated

⁸ I have examined copies of Fra Felice’s rabbinical Bible in the Center for Advanced Judaic Studies of the University of Pennsylvania, the New York Public Library, and Union Theological Library. Because I do not read Hebrew I am relying on the brief descriptions found in Basil Hall, “Biblical Scholarship: Editions and Commentaries,” in P.R. Ackroyd, C.F. Evans, G.W.H. Lampe, and S.L. Greenslade, eds., *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, 3 (1963–1970; repr. Cambridge, 1975), pp. 52–53 (whole article is pp. 38–93) (hereafter CHB); and Zangari, “Felice da Prato,” p. 44. Leo X’s printing privilege issued before 23 April 1515 is summarized in Simonsohn, *Documents: 1464–1521*, p. 1555 (document 1242). See also the comments of Simonsohn, *History*, pp. 335–36.

both Bibles to Leo X, who gave him ten-year exclusive printing privileges for them.

In his dedicatory letter to Leo X in the rabbinical Bible, Fra Felice cast his scholarship in humanistic terms. Just as ancient Greek and Latin learning had been renewed, so could the Hebrew language through this Bible. Fra Felice claimed to have collated many manuscripts, including some with numerous errors, and to have gathered together the commentaries. He credited Bomberg with bearing the costs of gathering and collating manuscripts. He believed that the Hebrew commentaries and the Targum would reveal hidden meanings of the Old Testament which would help Christians to understand better their faith and stimulate Christian piety. However, the letter is not found in many copies of the work. It is likely that Bomberg included it in copies intended for Christian readers, but omitted it in copies intended for Jewish readers, who would have constituted the larger market for the work.⁹

In or about 1518 Fra Felice returned to Rome where he spent most of the rest of his long life. He apparently was on excellent terms with Leo X and Cardinal Giles of Viterbo (Egidio Antonini, 1469–1532), for whom he translated cabalistic works, and was a member of the household of another Tuscan, Cardinal Pietro Accolti (1455–1524). Fra Felice taught theology, engaged in theological disputes, and participated in conversion efforts with Jews. He went to Spain in 1522 in order to discuss matters concerning the Augustinian Hermits with the newly-elected Adrian VI and held high positions in his order, including procurator in 1526 and 1528.¹⁰

Fra Felice did not completely abandon Venice but probably returned to help edit the Babylonian Talmud. The most important Hebrew publication of the Renaissance, it was issued by Daniel Bomberg in fifteen folio volumes in Venice between 1520 and 1523, again with a ten-year printing privilege of Leo X. This work was supposed to include responses by Fra Felice to Jewish objections to Christianity,

⁹ None of the three copies of the rabbinical Bible examined has the dedication letter to Leo X. However, Kahle, "Zwei Ausgaben der Hebräischen Bibel," pp. 132–34, presents a photograph of the dedicatory letter to Leo X and a German translation. He also quotes from the Latin and discusses the dedicatory letter in Lazarus Goldschmidt, *The Earliest Editions of the Hebrew Bible With a Treatise on the Oldest Manuscripts of the Bible by Paul Kahle* (New York, 1950), pp. 42–45 (by Kahle). See also a very short summary in Simonsohn, *History*, p. 335.

¹⁰ Kahle, "Zwei Ausgaben der Hebräischen Bibel," pp. 131–32; Zangari, "Felice da Prato," p. 43.

but did not, and this generated criticism. In 1532 Pope Clement VII absolved Bomberg for not including Fra Felice's responses, but forbade him from printing the Babylonian Talmud in the future and selling his remaining copies. However, Bomberg had already reprinted the work in 1526 and he produced a revised edition in 1548. It is not likely that he stopped selling copies of any of the editions.¹¹

Fra Felice was a biblical humanist who put his Hebrew philological skills and knowledge of Jewish learning in the service of Christianity. He believed that scholarship on the Hebrew Old Testament would help Christians to understand better the foundations of their faith and become more pious. It would also help to convert Jews.

Agostino Giustiniani (1470–1536) was a Hebrew biblical scholar with a pronounced humanistic point of view.¹² The son of a man from a prominent family who undertook important diplomatic charges for the Republic of Genoa, Agostino was expected to follow a similar career. However, Giustiniani became a friar, despite family objections. In 1487 he joined a monastery in Pavia which was part of the Congregation of Observant Dominicans of Lombardy. Ordained a priest in Bologna in 1494, he began to study for a doctorate in theology in the Dominican *studium generale* there, which undoubtedly offered a traditional scholastic curriculum. However, he also studied Greek, Hebrew, and other languages, and acquired fame in Bolognese humanistic circles as a biblical scholar. In 1513 he published a study of the seventy-two names of God, a work that demonstrated his competence in Hebrew and knowledge of Neo-Platonic sources. As part of his studies for a doctorate in theology, Giustiniani was required to lecture on the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard, which he began in 1512. However, in 1514 he asked to be relieved of lecturing on the *Sentences*, possibly a sign of his anti-scholastic views

¹¹ Zangari, "Felice da Prato," p. 44; and Sholomo Simonsohn, *The Apostolic See and the Jews. Documents: 1522–1538* (Toronto, 1990), pp. 1837–39 (doc. 1559 and comments).

¹² Unless otherwise indicated, the life of Giustiniani is based on Aurelio Cevolotto, *Agostino Giustiniani: Un umanista tra Bibbia e Cabala* (Genoa, 1992); Cevolotto, "Giustiniani, Agostino," DBI 57, pp. 301–06; "Augustinus Justiniani," in Jacobus Quétif and Jacobus Echard, eds., *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum*, 2, pt. 1 (1917–1921, repr. New York, n. d.), pp. 96–99; and R. Gerald Hobbs, "Agostino Giustiniani," in CEBR 2, pp. 102–03. François Secret, "Les grammairies hébraïques d'Augustinus Justinianus," *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 33 (1963), 269–79; and Gorge K. Hasselhoff, "Die Drucke einzelner lateinischer Übersetzungen von Werken des Maimonides im 16. Jahrhundert als Beitrag zur Entstehung der modernen Hebraistik: Agostino Giustiniani und Sebastian Münster," in Giuseppe Veltri and Gerold Necker, eds., *Gottes Sprache in der philologischen Werkstatt. Hebraistik vom 15. bis zum 19. Jahrhundert* (Leiden and Boston, 2004), pp. 169–88.

and humanistic preferences. In June 1514 he was back in Genoa at the convent of Santa Maria di Castello. In that same year he was appointed bishop of Nebbio in northern Corsica, thanks to the influence of his cousin, Cardinal Bandinello Sauli (d. 1518).

At this time Giustiniani wrote to Sauli that for many years he had been preparing a polyglot Bible in Hebrew, Latin, Greek, Aramaic, and Arabic; he had nearly finished the Old Testament and had done considerable work on the New Testament. He wished to bring God's truth to all, including Greeks and Muslims. Giustiniani believed that philology would reveal the authentic content of Christian truth, a typical humanist view, and he rejected what he viewed as the sophistical abstractions of scholastics. He hoped that Sauli would support the cost of printing.¹³ When Sauli did not provide the necessary funding Giustiniani decided to publish at his own expense a polyglot version of the Psalms as a first step.

Giustiniani could not find a printer with the necessary expertise and fonts in Genoa, a very minor publishing center, so he brought in a Milanese printer, Pietro Paolo Porro, and they probably labored over the book for much of a year. The result was *Psalterium Hebraeum, Graecum, Arabicum, et Chaldaeum cum tribus Latinis interpretationibus et glossis*. Colophon: Genoa: Pietro Porro, 16 October 1516.¹⁴ Often called *Octaplum Psalterium* from the title that Giustiniani gave it in his preface, it is a folio-sized volume of 400 pages. Eight parallel columns of text are spread across every two pages, verso and recto. The Hebrew text appears in column one, Giustiniani's Latin translation in column two, Jerome's Vulgate translation in column three, the Greek text from the Septuagint in column four, Giustiniani's Arabic translation in column five, the Aramaic Targum paraphrase in column six, Giustiniani's Latin translation of the Targum in column seven, and his Latin scholia and commentary in column eight. In addition, Giustiniani's commentary sometimes runs across the bottom of the two pages and continues at

¹³ Cevolotto, *Giustiniani*, pp. 42–44.

¹⁴ Agostino Giustiniani, *Psalterium Hebraeum, Graecum, Arabicum et Chaldaeum, cum tribus Latinis interpretationibus et glossis*. . . (Genoa, 1516). Colophon: Impressit miro ingenio Petrus Paulus Porrus Genua in aedibus Nicolai Iustiniani Pauli. The title of the combination preface and dedication to Leo X at sig. Aii recto reads: "Aug. Iustiniani Genuensis Praedicatorum Ordinis Episcopi Nebiensis in Octaplum Psalterium ad Leonem X Pontificem Maximum Praefatio . . . Genuae Calendis Augusti MDXVI." The copy examined is that of the Center for Advanced Judaic Studies of the University of Pennsylvania.

the top of the next two pages before the presentation of a new verse in eight columns. The complex volume must have tested Porro's skills and had to have been expensive. Nevertheless, Giustiniani printed 2,000 copies, double the size of the normal press run at that time, in paper and fifty in vellum. But he sold only a quarter of them.¹⁵

In his preface Giustiniani wrote that it was the task of priests to understand and interpret Holy Scripture,¹⁶ and making the Scriptures available in multiple languages was essential toward this end. Giustiniani did not see the *Octaplum Psalterium* as complete in itself but the first part of the publication of a complete polyglot Bible for the benefit of the Church and especially the clergy. He probably began with the Psalms because they were the heart of the canonical office, the prayers that, at first by custom and later by canon law, priests, monks, and nuns were obliged to recite daily at different times of the day.

Giustiniani's work was fundamentally a translation and explanation of the Psalms based on the Hebrew text and traditional Hebrew scholarship.¹⁷ He found the Vulgate translation to be untrustworthy and presented his own. His commentary is mostly linguistic and philological, as he clarified the Hebrew and justified his translations by reference to Jewish scholarship. He frequently cited Hebrew sources against Jerome's translation, making use of midrash, that is, biblical exegesis which tries to make every word and verse intelligible, and haggadah, that is, additional rational and supernatural explanations for passages difficult to understand or seemingly incomplete. Jewish midrash and haggadah originated in the third century B. C. and continued through much of the Middle Ages.¹⁸ He also used cabalistic literature, notably the *Sepher Zohar* (Book of Splendor) attributed to Rabbi Simeon ben Iochai, who may have been a contemporary of Christ.¹⁹ He referred many times to "Rabbi Solomon," that is, Rabbi Solomon ben Isaac or Rashi, who wrote a well-known commentary on the Psalms. And he

¹⁵ Cevolotto, *Giustiniani*, p. 45.

¹⁶ "Nihil enim aeque sacerdoti convenit, quam sacrarum literarum expositio & interpretatio." Preface dedicated to Leo X, in Giustiniani, *Psalterium Hebraeum*, sig. Aii recto.

¹⁷ What follows is based on analysis of the work plus the excellent comments of Cevolotto, *Giustiniani*, pp. 42–62, 65–72.

¹⁸ For a good explanation and many examples, see G. Vermes, "Bible and Midrash: Early Old Testament Exegesis," in CHB 1, pp. 199–231.

¹⁹ See also François Secret, *Les kabbalistes chrétiens de la Renaissance* (Paris, 1964), pp. 99–102 and idem, "Les Dominicains et la kabbale chrétienne à la Renaissance," *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 37 (1957), pp. 321–24, 334–35 (whole article, pp. 319–36).

used the important Psalm commentary of David Kimhi. Giustiniani distinguished between “ancient Hebrew fathers,” whom he believed were favorable to Christianity and possibly even Christian, and “juniores hebrei,” that is, medieval Jewish scholars who were, in his view, the product of a deformed post-biblical Jewish scholarship and hostile to Christianity. Indeed, Rashi and Kimhi explicitly rejected Christological interpretations of Psalm passages. But that did not stop Giustiniani from making use of their philological expertise.

Giustiniani’s *Octaplum Psalterium* applied Jewish learning to the translation and understanding of the Psalms, although his interpretation was strongly Christian and traditionally prophetic and messianic. For example, for Psalm 1.1 “Beatus vir” (Blessed is the man who follows not the counsel of the wicked), Giustiniani offered the traditional Christian interpretation that the verse referred to Jesus Christ. However, four lines later he inserted a eight-line quotation from Rabbi Simeon, an indication of his desire to include considerable Jewish learning.²⁰ Overall, Giustiniani combined extensive philological notes based on Hebrew sources and the expected Christological interpretation of passages seen as prophesying the coming of Christ.

Giustiniani manifested a humanist outlook throughout the work. In the first few pages he cited Origen of Alexandria (c. 185–c. 254), the historian Eusebius of Caesarea (c. 263–c. 340), Hilary of Poitiers (c. 300/325–c. 367) who wrote a Psalm commentary and other works, Augustine of Hippo (354–430), Ambrose of Milan (c. 340–397) who wrote Scriptural commentaries, and the Christian Roman senator Cassiodorus (c. 490–c. 583). He continued to refer to the Church Fathers throughout the work. Extensive reliance on the patristic tradition was an essential part of the humanist approach to Scripture. But Giustiniani also believed that he had surpassed the Fathers. Origen, the most prolific and important biblical scholar of the ancient world, had produced a *Hexapla* (now lost), a six-part version of the Old Testament consisting of the Hebrew text, a transcription of the Hebrew text, two Greek versions, then the Septuagint, followed by another Greek version. Giustiniani informed readers that his eight-part *Octaplum Psalterium* used more languages.²¹ In addition, Giustiniani’s references to “instrumentum” and “novum atque

²⁰ “B. vir iste est Christus Iesus verbum Dei, verus Deus, verusque homo, quim descendisse de celis (*sic*) pro salute humani generis...” Giustiniani, *Octaplum Psalterium*, sig. Av verso.

²¹ Giustiniani, *Octaplum Psalterium*, sig. Aii recto.

vetus instrumentum” in the preface probably were meant to align himself with Erasmus, even though he never mentioned the Dutch scholar. Erasmus’ *Novum Instrumentum* (a Greek and Latin New Testament with annotations) had appeared about 1 March 1516.²² Giustiniani mentioned only Lefèvre d’Étaples among contemporary biblical scholars.²³ He completely ignored scholastic authorities.²⁴ He emphasized that he was providing an accurate word-for-word translation.

Giustiniani’s work is also remembered for an unusual scholium. In his comment on Psalm 19:4 (Their music goes out through all the earth, their words reach to the end of the world) he suddenly launched into a description of Columbus’ voyages to the New World and praise for his deeds.²⁵ Although one of the earliest accounts of the voyages, Giustiniani’s sources are unknown and the reasons for mentioning Columbus unclear. He was obviously proud of the accomplishments of a fellow Genoese. And he may have seen Columbus as God’s instrument, who revealed more of God’s creation and found new peoples to be brought to Christ.

In the first sentence of his combination preface and dedication to Leo X, Giustiniani reminded the pope that news of his scholarship had earlier come to the pontiff’s ears.²⁶ Moreover, Giustiniani hoped that the pope would help bring his work to fruition, that is, would support the publication of the entire polyglot Bible, a project that would have

²² The colophon was dated 1 February and the annotations 1 March 1516. Erasmus announced on 7 March that the work was published. CWE 3, p. 216, headnote to Ep. 384.

²³ Cevolotto counts eight references to “Faber” and about another dozen cases in which Giustiniani might be using Lefèvre’s work. Cevolotto, *Giustiniani*, p. 92, note 70. For example, Giustiniani refers to “Fabri nostri” in his discussion of Psalm 8:6. *Octaplum Psalterium*, sig. Bi recto.

²⁴ The only medieval figure noticed in a rapid perusal of the work was a passing reference to St. Bernard. Giustiniani, *Octaplum Psalterium*, sig. Ciiii recto.

²⁵ Giustiniani, *Octaplum Psalterium*, sigs. Cvii recto–D recto. For an English translation of the Columbus material, see Giustiniani, *Exploring the Edge: Giustiniani’s account of Columbus in the margins of the 1516 Polyglot Psalter* (Berkeley, CA, 1993). For speculation on the reasons and sources for the scholium, see Cevolotto, *Giustiniani*, pp. 58–61; and G.N. Zazzu, “La glossa al Salmo XX nel Salterio Ottaplo di A. Giustiniani,” in Angelo Vivian, ed., *Biblische und judaistische Studien: Festschrift für Paolo Sacchi* (Frankfurt am Main, 1990), pp. 575–82.

²⁶ “Accio pater beatissime perlatum ad aures tuas iam diu laborasse nos...instrumentum quinque praecipuis linguis, hebraea, chaldaea, graeca, latina & arabica...” Giustiniani, *Octaplum Psalterium*, sig. Aii recto. Cevolotto, *Giustiniani*, p. 51, speculates that Cardinal Giles of Viterbo may have mentioned Giustiniani to Leo, because there are many references to Giustiniani in the cardinal’s works.

rivalled in size and complexity the Complutensian Polyglot, which did not include Arabic. If there was a papal response, it has escaped notice. Nevertheless, after publishing his *Octapulum Psalterium*, Giustiniani went to Rome in late 1516. He joined Cardinal Sauli and participated in sessions of the Fifth Lateran Council in mid-December 1516 and in March 1517.

Giustiniani wished to establish himself in Rome and win papal support. And one wonders what contacts, if any, he had in Rome with two fellow Dominicans, the biblical humanist Santi Pagnini and the future biblical scholar Cardinal Tommaso de Vio Cajetan. But his hopes of papal support probably vanished when the plot of cardinals to kill Leo was uncovered in late April 1517. Cardinal Sauli, Giustiniani's cousin and sponsor, was deeply involved; although he escaped execution he had to pay a large fine, was disgraced, and died in March 1518.²⁷ Giustiniani was not involved, and he later wrote in his autobiography that Leo X looked on him kindly and was inclined to relieve his poverty. Nevertheless, Giustiniani did not stay in Rome. When King Francis I, possibly urged by his confessor and adviser, Etienne Poncher, bishop of Paris, invited him to teach Hebrew at Paris as a royal lecturer, he accepted. Giustiniani left Rome in early 1518, and by April was teaching at the *studium* of the Dominican monastery of Saint-Jacques and enjoying a handsome royal pension.²⁸

In the fall of 1518 Giustiniani journeyed to Leuven, where he met Erasmus in October. The Dutch humanist had sharply and gratuitously attacked Giustiniani and his *Octapulum Psalterium* because Lefèvre d'Étaples cited Giustiniani in support of his controversial reading of Psalm 8:6. The traditional reading was "Minuisti eum paulo minus ab angelis" (Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels). In his *Quincuplex Psalterium* of 1509, and in subsequent editions of 1513 and 1515, Lefèvre argued that the text should read "Minuisti eum paulo minus a Deo" (Thou hast made him a little lower than God). Erasmus disagreed in his *Novum Instrumentum* of 1516, in which the issue arose because Hebrews 2:7 quotes Psalm 8:6.²⁹ In his *Octapulum Psalterium*

²⁷ For Sauli's involvement and punishment, see Ludwig von Pastor, *A History of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages*, 8, trans. F. I. Antrobus et al. (London and St. Louis, 1891–1953), pp. 174, 178, 181–82, 184, 186–88 and 193–95; and D.S. Chambers, "Bandinello Sauli," in CEBR 3, pp. 198–99.

²⁸ Cevolotto, *Giustiniani*, pp. 76–79.

²⁹ See Guy Bedouelle's introduction to CWE 83, pp. xviii–xix and his essay in this volume, above pp. 117–141.

Giustiniani also argued, on the basis of the Aramaic Targum and the Hebrew text, that the reading should be “a little less than God.”³⁰ Lefèvre replied to Erasmus in his notes to the second edition of his commentary on Paul’s epistles (dated 1515 but published in 1516), again while discussing Hebrews 2:7. Lefèvre held to his reading and cited Giustiniani’s *Octaplum Psalterium* in support.

Erasmus then wrote an *Apologia ad Iacobum Fabrum Stapulensem*, published in late August 1517, in which he included a mean-spirited attack on Giustiniani and his *Octaplum Psalterium*. Erasmus dismissed as unimportant Giustiniani’s annotations based on Jewish, cabalistic, Talmudic, and rabbinical authors (Erasmus had little knowledge of any of them) because they were “few in number” (although Giustiniani made many references to them), “feeble,” and had “very little relevance to our Christ.” He attacked Giustiniani’s knowledge of Greek and Latin, and saw no useful purpose in his translations of the Psalms into other languages. What Erasmus did not admit was that he had little comprehension of Hebrew and Aramaic, and no Arabic.³¹ The attack showed Erasmus at his ill-tempered and nasty worst. After meeting Giustiniani in Leuven in October 1518, Erasmus relented a little, calling him a man of “more vanity than venom” and promised to amend his harsh words against Giustiniani in the next edition of the *Apologia ad Fabrum*.³² But he never changed the text. After the meeting with Erasmus Giustiniani went on to England, where he met John Fisher and possibly Thomas More and other English humanists.

In 1519 and 1520 Giustiniani edited several works for Parisian publishers, most of them dealing with Hebrew scholarship. He edited a new version of the Hebrew grammar of Moses Kimhi (d. c. 1190), brother of David Kimhi. He edited and published a medieval Latin translation of Maimonides’ *Guide to the Perplexed*, in the preface of which he argued that Jewish exegetical studies were useful to Christians. Giustiniani also edited a medieval work which argued that one could find confirmation of the Trinity in the Hebrew word for God. But his biblical scholarship was limited to three short works intended

³⁰ Giustiniani, *Octaplum Psalterium*, sig. B verso–Bii recto. See also Cevolotto, *Giustiniani*, pp. 56–57.

³¹ Erasmus, *Apology against Jacques Lefèvre d’Etaples*, in CWE 83, pp. 20–22.

³² See CWE 6, Ep. 877: 13–17, with the “more vanity than venom” quote; *ibid.*, Ep. 878: 2–5, which repeats the “more vanity than venom” quote; and *ibid.*, Ep. 906: 529–35, in which he promised to emend the *Apologia*. Cevolotto, *Giustiniani*, pp. 82–84, reviews the matter, as does Hobbs, “Giustiniani,” pp. 102–03.

for students: Latin translations from the Hebrew of the Book of Job, the Book of Ruth, and the Lamentations of Jeremiah. He continued to criticize the scholastic tradition.

In August 1519 Erasmus, then in Antwerp, wrote that there were many things in the works of Giustiniani, and his fellow Dominicans Silvester Mazzolini Prierias and Tommaso de Vio Cajetan, that shocked the Paris theologians.³³ Paris theologians might easily have found fault with Giustiniani for his criticism of, and frequent departures from, the Vulgate; for his extensive use of Hebrew scholarship including the cabala; and for his lack of respect for scholastic authorities. Some Paris theologians may have criticized Giustiniani verbally and Erasmus, who had contacts in Paris, may have heard about it. However, the Faculty of Theology of the University of Paris took no known action against Giustiniani then or later.³⁴

Nevertheless, Giustiniani did not remain in Paris. He returned to Genoa in 1522 and then went to Corsica where he spent most of the rest of his life. He worked hard at improving the religious life of his diocese and raising the educational level of its priests. He also found time to write an annalistic history of Genoa that became an important source for future historians. He drafted the first modern description of Corsica (not printed until 1882) with interesting demographic, economic, and geographical information. But he did not publish any more biblical scholarship. Although there is limited evidence that he finished, or almost finished, his polyglot Bible, no manuscript has been found.³⁵ He died in 1536, probably at sea on his way to Corsica.

The next biblical humanist, Santi Pagnini (1470–1536), was a Tuscan Dominican friar particularly skilled in Hebrew. Born in Lucca, Pagnini joined the Order of Preachers in 1487.³⁶ He lived in the Dominican

³³ “You find nothing amiss in the works of Agostino Giustiniani, of Silvester Prierias, of Tommaso de Vio who is now cardinal of San Sisto; and yet there are many things in them that shock the Paris theologians not a little.” Erasmus to Jacob of Hoogstraten of 11 August 1519, in *CWE* 7, Ep. 1006: 153–56, and note 21 on pp. 364–65.

³⁴ The published proceedings from 1505 through 1523 of the Faculty of Theology of the University of Paris do not mention Giustiniani. I am grateful to James K. Farge for checking the volume, and the subsequent volume for 1524 to 1533, both of which were unavailable to me.

³⁵ Cevolotto, *Giustiniani*, pp. 44, 85–91, 94–96, and the bibliography of Giustiniani’s works on pp. 139–40; “Augustinus Justiniani,” in *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum*, 2, pt. 1, pp. 98–99; and Cevolotto, “Giustiniani,” pp. 303–05.

³⁶ For Pagnini’s life and works, see “Santes Pagninus,” in *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum*, 2, pt. 1, pp. 114–18; Giovanni Luzzi, *Santi Pagnini e la sua traduzione latina della Bibbia*

convent of Fiesole, studied in Bologna, and then returned to the Fiesole convent as a teacher. Most important, he lived in the Florentine convent of San Marco when Girolamo Savonarola led it from 1490 to 1498. On or before 1492 Pagnini began intense study of Hebrew with a fellow Dominican, who was a former Spanish rabbi, and Greek, with an unknown teacher. Under Savonarola's leadership the monks at San Marco emphasized the study of the Bible and ancient languages, and some contemporaries believed that Savonarola inspired Pagnini to study ancient languages and the Bible. Whether true or not, Pagnini was a follower and admirer of Savonarola for the rest of his life. Pagnini quickly became convinced, perhaps by his Hebrew teacher, that the Vulgate translation of the Old Testament was inadequate, and began intensive study of the Hebrew Old Testament.

After Savonarola's stormy career came to an end with his hanging on 23 May 1498,³⁷ Pagnini became a leader of the Observant Congregation of San Marco, which had several convents in Tuscany. Between 1502 and 1516 he served as prior of monasteries in Pistoia, Siena, Lucca (twice), and San Marco in Florence (twice). In 1516 he was called to Rome and in 1517 he became prior of the Dominican monastery of Santa Maria sopra Minerva there, holding that position until 1519. He also taught in Rome, possibly both Greek and Hebrew, most likely at Santa Maria sopra Minerva. Johann Maier Eck learned Hebrew from Pagnini during his Rome years.³⁸

(Torre Pellice, n. d.). This is the booklet form of Luzzi's long article with a slightly different title published in *Bollettino della Società di Studi Valdesi* 79 (1943), pp. 1–18; *ibid.*, 80 (1943), pp. 1–21; *ibid.*, 81 (1944), pp. 1–23; and *ibid.*, 82 (1944), pp. 1–11. See also Timoteo M. Centi, O.P., "L'attività letteraria di Santi Pagnini (1470–1536) nel campo delle scienze bibliche," *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 15 (1945), pp. 5–51; Anna Morisi Guerra, "Incontri ebraico-cristiani: Il salterio poliglotta di Santi Pagnini," in *Itinerari ebraico-cristiani: società, cultura, mito* (Fasano, 1987), pp. 9–37; and Morisi Guerra, "Santi Pagnini traduttore de la Bible," in Irena Backus and Francis Higman, eds., *Théorie et pratique de l'exégèse: Actes du troisième colloque international sur l'histoire de l'exégèse biblique au XVI^e siècle (Genève, 31 août–2 septembre 1988)* (Geneva, 1990), pp. 191–98. Pagnini's monastic first name appears in various forms: Sante, Santi, latinized as Sanctes or Santes, and even hellenized as Xantes. Italian scholars prefer Santi, the form used here.

³⁷ Contrary to what some historians write, Savonarola was not burnt at the stake. Rather, he and two companions were hanged above a pile of wood. After they were dead, the wood was set on fire, and the blaze consumed their bodies.

³⁸ Centi, "L'attività di Pagnini," p. 12, and Morisi Guerra, "Incontri," p. 12, state that Pagnini taught "publicly." But it is not likely that he taught at the University of Rome. Although no faculty rolls between 1514 and 1535 survive, neither Giuseppe Carafa, *De Gymnasio Romano et de eius professoribus* (1751, repr. Bologna, 1971); nor Filippo Maria

Throughout his peregrinations Pagnini had continued his intense biblical studies. He concentrated on the Old Testament because, in his view, scholars had found Erasmus' Greek New Testament satisfactory. He arrived in Rome with an immense manuscript of a polyglot Old Testament, possibly almost finished, and while there, he examined Hebrew manuscripts which Leo X made available to him.³⁹ He showed part of his work, a polyglot Psalter, to Leo X. After reading some pages, the pope became enthusiastic and promised to pay the costs of printing it. In addition, six theologians examined his work and found no error.⁴⁰ Thus, in 1520 or slightly earlier, Pagnini began to print his polyglot Psalter, the first part of what he hoped would be an entire polyglot Bible. It appeared as *Psalterium nuper translatum ex Hebraeo, Chaldaeo et Graeco per R. P. Fratrem Sanctum Pagninum Lucensem Praedicatorium Ordinis Congregationis Thusciae cum Commentariis Hebraeorum per eundem translatis, et scholiis eiusdem cum orthodoxa atque Catholica expositione*. ([Rome]: n.pr. 1521). It was a large quarto or small folio volume of 192 leaves presenting the first twenty-seven Psalms (twenty-eight in the Hebrew numbering) and all but the last verse of Psalm 28.⁴¹ He dedicated the truncated Psalter, which survives in only two copies, to Leo X.

In his dedicatory letter Pagnini emphasized the importance of the original language. He lamented bad translations and allied himself with the humanist movement by citing Giovanni Pico (1463–1494), Ermolao Barbaro (1453–1493), and Angelo Poliziano (1454–1494) as scholars who had helped to identify and expunge errors from bad translations.⁴² He noted that bad translations from Greek medical texts misinformed physicians who then prescribed poisons instead of healing herbs, a sentiment dear to Italian medical humanists. But the damage done by mistranslating Holy Scripture was potentially far more serious, because bad translations aided the enemies of truth. The solution

Renazzi, *Storia dell'Università degli Studi di Roma* (1803–1806, repr. Bologna, 1971), list him as teaching at the Studium Urbis, as the University of Rome was then called.

³⁹ Centi, "L'attività di Pagnini," p. 28.

⁴⁰ Listed in Morisi Guerra, "Incontri," p. 28, note 34, they included four Dominicans, including Tommaso Radini Tedeschi, Vice-Master of the Sacred Palace, and Pietro Galatino, a Franciscan Observant and Christian cabalist.

⁴¹ The citation comes from Centi, "L'attività di Pagnini," p. 13; and Morisi Guerra, "Santi Pagnini traducteur de la Bible," p. 192, note 3. There are two known extant copies, one in the Biblioteca Casanatense in Rome, the other in the Biblioteca Nazionale Braidense in Milan.

⁴² Morisi Guerra, "Incontri," pp. 24–27, summarizes the dedicatory letter. Some of this is also found in Morisi Guerra, "Santi Pagnini traducteur de la Bible," p. 196.

was to understand clearly Hebrew, the original language, and greater than all other languages, in Pagnini's view. God had created Hebrew at the time of the creation of the world, and Holy Scripture, inspired by God and written in the language that God created, enabled man to know God's will. Every word of the original text was charged with meaning and mystery. Pagnini wished to present the literal meaning of the Hebrew text, and to explain it in every possible way, so that the reader who did not read Hebrew could penetrate the underlying logic and structure of the Hebrew and arrive at an understanding of God's word.

Pagnini presented each Psalm in Hebrew followed by a Latin translation.⁴³ Then he reiterated individual verses in Hebrew followed by comments by medieval Jewish exegetes, especially Abraham ibn Ezra (1089–1164) and David Kimhi, who wrote literal, grammatical, and etymological exegeses. Next Pagnini presented the verse in Aramaic from the Targum along with Latin translation and notes. Finally, he gave each verse in Greek, again with Latin translation, followed by comments by Christian authors, especially Augustine and Cassiodorus, but also Origen, Basil the Great of Caesarea (c. 330–379), Jerome (c. 331–419/420), and Ambrose. Sometimes Pagnini added his own brief comments.

Pagnini's Psalter was an extraordinarily detailed word-by-word explanation by means of quotations from numerous sources, especially Hebrew commentaries. It moved from literal explanation, to grammatical exploration, to the significance of the words, and then to related words. One word or passage in a certain context brought to mind another passage containing the same word or a different word derived from the same root. Pagnini developed the significance of words and allusions, and eventually arrived at Christological interpretations. His biblical scholarship at times resembled that of Lefèvre d'Etaples, who proceeded from the literal explanation to mystical meaning.⁴⁴

Pagnini did not finish printing his Psalter. He stopped by August 1521 when Leo X cut off funds because he was putting everything he

⁴³ This and the following paragraphs are based on Centi, "L'attività di Pagnini," pp. 13–14; Morisi Guerra, "Santi Pagnini traduttore de la Bible," pp. 196–97; and idem, "Incontri," pp. 27–37. The latter two works provide examples of Pagnini's exegesis.

⁴⁴ Morisi Guerra, "Incontri," pp. 34–35.

could into war preparations.⁴⁵ And prospects for alternate funding in Rome were bleak. Leo X died on 1 December 1521, and Adrian VI was elected on 9 January 1522. But he did not enter Rome until 27 August and was not crowned until 31 August. Burdened with Leo's debts and not a generous supporter of learning in any case, Adrian apparently did not help Pagnini.

Pagnini published a Talmudic lexicon in Rome, 1523, with the printing expenses paid by the prior of Santa Maria sopra Minerva, the Florentine Tommaso Strozzi. The book listed Aramaic words found in the Targum, translated them into Latin, explained their meaning, and made comparisons with Greek, Arabic, and Persian words, although Pagnini may not have understood Persian very well. He dedicated the work to Cardinal François d'Auch of Clermont, the papal legate in Avignon. This new connection proved fruitful. In or about June 1523 Pagnini followed the cardinal to Avignon and never returned to Italy. In Avignon he probably taught Greek and Hebrew and acquired a doctorate of theology. He published a Greek grammar with an appended dictionary in Avignon in 1525, and continued to work on his polyglot Bible. Since Avignon lacked a printer capable of doing the complicated work required, Pagnini went to Lyon in 1526 where he published a Hebrew grammar that had several printings.⁴⁶

In Lyon he found a flourishing Tuscan merchant community, including a number of Florentine Republican exiles. With financial support from the Tuscans there, including two relatives, Pagnini began in the fall of 1526 to have his Bible printed by a local press. It was finished in January 1528: *Biblia. Habes in hoc libro...utrusque instrumenti novam translationem aeditam a...Sancte Pagnino...Necnon et librum de interpretamentis hebraicorum, aramaeorum, graecorumque nominum...* Lyon: Antoine du Ry, 1528).⁴⁷ In short, it was a new translation based on the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek, printed in a substantial quarto volume with two

⁴⁵ This information comes from a letter of 16 August 1521 by a friend of Pagnini who wrote to the city council of Lucca asking it to provide funds to continue printing Pagnini's psalter. The city council politely declined. Morisi Guerra, "Incontri," pp. 15–16, who also argues (p. 17) that the Reuchlin controversy had made Leo hesitant to support Hebrew scholarly projects. Perhaps, but Leo's spendthrift ways had so depleted the papal treasury that there was little money for anything by the end of his pontificate.

⁴⁶ Centi, "L'attività di Pagnini," pp. 15–22.

⁴⁷ This is an abbreviated form of the title. The full title, given in Centi, "L'attività di Pagnini," p. 24, is 134 words long. Luzzi, *Santi Pagnini*, p. 24; and Morisi Guerra, "Incontri," p. 13 note 4, also give short versions of the title.

narrow columns of text per page. Pagnini used Erasmus' Greek New Testament but departed from it when he believed that the Dutch humanist erred.⁴⁸ The lengthy full title also proclaimed that it was based on Latin and Hebrew manuscripts; for the Hebrew he may have used notes from his research on the manuscripts that Leo made available to him. And Pagnini added an appendix which explained Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek names. However, it was only a Latin translation, lacking explanations for his translation decisions. And it was far from perfectly printed.

Pagnini dedicated his Bible to Clement VII, and it carried permissions to print from Adrian VI and Clement VII. In addition, Pagnini wrote that he had heard from friends that Clement was considering appointing a commission of experts to make a new Latin translation of the entire Bible. If that should happen, Pagnini asserted that he would be happy to see his work corrected by the commission. Pagnini further argued that he was not attacking Jerome's Vulgate, even though he made many changes. Finally, in a prologue Pagnini voiced a scholarly manifesto. He declared that he had abandoned rhetoric in order to exalt the divine, which might be read as an attempt to distance himself a little from the humanists. But he also criticized unnamed scholars who boasted that they were Platonists, Pythagoreans, Academic Skeptics, Stoics, Cynics, Aristotelians, Averroists, Thomists, and Scotists, and wasted their time disputing about instances, relations, quiddities, and formalities.⁴⁹ This was a typical humanist anti-scholastic topos.

His 1528 Bible was a Latin translation. It was not the polyglot Bible with extensive additional material that Pagnini had been preparing for over a quarter of a century, a work that might have had the same amount of detail as his psalter. Nevertheless, Pagnini's Latin Bible was innovative and very influential. He provided a literal Latin translation from the Hebrew for the Old Testament, and this proved to be very useful to others. His awkward but literal and accurate Latin translation enabled readers and scholars with limited skill in Hebrew to gain a better understanding of the underlying Hebrew.⁵⁰ And Pagnini numbered the verses, making it the first printed Bible to do so. The verse numbers

⁴⁸ Morisi Guerra, "Santi Pagnini traduttore di la Bible," p. 198, makes this point.

⁴⁹ See the long passage quoted in Centi, "L'attività di Pagnini," p. 26.

⁵⁰ Centi, "L'attività di Pagnini," pp. 22–28; Luzzi, *Santi Pagnini*, pp. 28–41; and Hall, "Biblical Scholarship," pp. 69–70, discuss Pagnini's Bible.

appear in the left margin and between the two columns, while in the text symbols (C) divide the verses, producing a heavy-looking and unattractive printed page. No other printed Bible numbered verses for some thirty years, although some printed Psalters did. Another innovation was to group the apocryphal books together in a separate section placed between the two Testaments.⁵¹

Pagnini's Bible had a considerable number of printings in the sixteenth century and beyond and became the foundation text for other Bibles.⁵² Both Catholic and Protestant scholars used Pagnini's Latin Old Testament as the base text for their own Latin versions of the Old Testament, the same role that Erasmus' New Testament edition often played for other editions of the New Testament. The Jesuit Benito Arias Montano (1527–1598) revised Pagnini's Old Testament for the famous royal polyglot Bible published by Christoph Plantin between 1569 and 1572. Pagnini's Latin Bible also provided the text for several Italian Protestant translations. In addition, Michael Servetus produced a revised version, as did Robert Estienne in his 1557 Bible, while major English language Protestant Bibles, including those of William Tyndale, Miles Coverdale, and the Geneva Bible of 1560, used Pagnini. So did Pierre Robert Olivetan, who produced a French Protestant translation of the Bible. Even Jewish scholars respected Pagnini's Old Testament.

On the other hand, conservative theologians did not like Pagnini's biblical scholarship. In 1529 Agostino Steuco (1496–1549) published two works criticizing scholars who did not respect Jerome's Vulgate Old Testament. He alleged that they introduced translation novelties that

⁵¹ M.H. Black, "The Printed Bible," in CHB 3, pp. 436–37 (whole article pp. 408–75). See Plate 17 (no pagination) for a page from the Pagnini Bible illustrating the verse numbering system. His numbering is no longer followed.

⁵² For example, see *Biblica hebraica eorundem Latina interpretatio Xantis Pagnini Lucensis recen-ter Benedicti Ariae Montani Hispal. & quorundum aliorum collato studio...* (Antwerp: Ex officina Christophori Plantani, 1584). This is a Hebrew Old Testament with Pagnini's Latin translation inserted interlinearly, plus a Greek and Latin New Testament. Montano's prefatory letter explains that the Old Testament is based on Pagnini's edition; moreover, there are many other references to Pagnini in the front matter. Another version with many printings went under the names of Pagnini and François Vatable, a Christian Hebraist who lectured at the Collège de France in Paris: *Biblia veteris ac Novi Testamenti, summa fide ac studio singulari... tum verò in primi S. Pagnini ac Fr. Vatabli opera ita ex Hebraeis Graecisque...* (Basel: Per Thomam Guarinum, 1564). See "Santes Pagninus," in *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum*, 2, pt. 1, pp. 116–17, for some of the more important printings and revisions of Pagnini's Bible. For some of the many Catholic and Protestant Bibles based on Pagnini's versions, see Luzzi, *Santi Pagnini*, pp. 48–59; and CHB 3, pp. 55, 111, 118, 148, 157, 159, 171, 201, and 214.

gave the enemies of true religion, especially Jews, the impression that Christians were weak in their faith. Steuco listed a series of passages from the Vulgate and compared them with the “absurdities” found in newer versions. Although he did not attack Pagnini by name, the “absurdities” came from Pagnini’s Bible.⁵³

Pagnini continued to publish works useful to biblical scholars. He published *Thesaurus Linguae Sanctae* (Lyon, 1529), a Hebrew lexicon containing some 2,752 columns of text in a folio volume. Here Pagnini presented some of the extensive research that undergirded his Latin Old Testament. In order to explain the literal meanings of Hebrew words, he quoted, sometimes at length, the Old Testament, rabbinical sources, David Kimhi, Church Fathers, and ancient pagan classics. He referred to manuscripts and compared Hebrew words with their counterparts in Aramaic, Syriac, and Greek. It had many printings and epitomes. And in a work of 1536 he discussed both literal and mystical interpretations of Scripture.⁵⁴

Pagnini took an active role in the religious and communal life of Lyon. He preached and worked tirelessly for a broad and inclusive system of poor relief. And he never abandoned his Florentine Republican convictions forged in the convent with Savonarola. In 1527 the Florentines threw out the Medici and established a republic. The army of Charles V besieged Florence in April 1530 with the goal of restoring the Medici. Pagnini wrote to Henry VIII of England, begging him to rescue Florence. Henry failed to respond. Hence, Florence fell, and the Medici returned to power.⁵⁵ Pagnini died in Lyon in 1536.

Another biblical scholar with a knowledge of Hebrew who lived and taught in Rome for a few years was Agazio Guidacerio (1477?–1540).⁵⁶

⁵³ Morisi Guerra, “Santi Pagnini traduttore de la Bible,” pp. 193–94. The works of Steuco were *Recognitio Veteris Testamenti ad Hebraicam Veritatem* and a brief pamphlet *An Vulgata editio sit divi Hieronymi*. On Steuco see also Ronald Delph’s essay in this volume below, pp. 297–318.

⁵⁴ Centi, “L’attività di Pagnini,” pp. 28–42; and especially Max Engammare, “Sante Pagnini, traduttore *ad litteram* et exégète *secundum allegoriam* de l’écriture (1520–1536),” in Dominique de Courcelles, ed., *Philologie et subjectivité. Actes de la journée d’étude organisée per l’Ecole nationale des chartes, Paris, 5 avril 2001* (Paris, 2002), pp. 41–52.

⁵⁵ For Pagnini’s Savonarolan and Florentine sympathies, and his activities in Lyon, see Lorenzo Polizzotto, *The Elect Nation: The Savonarolan Movement in Florence 1494–1545* (Oxford, 1994), pp. 329, 376, 408–09.

⁵⁶ Helmuth Galliner, “Agathius Guidacerius 1477?–1540: An Early Hebrew Grammarian in Rome and Paris,” *Historia Judaica* 2 (1940), pp. 85–101; Paolo Pissavino, “Agazio Guidacerio,” in CEBR 2, pp. 149–50 (but with an incorrect death date); and Cesare Mulè, *Agazio Guidacerio: un umanista catanzarese a Parigi* (Rome, 1990), a disorganized

A secular priest from a Calabria family which may have been Jewish at one time, Guidacerio learned Hebrew from a Portuguese rabbi living in Italy and went to Rome at an unknown date. He published a short Hebrew grammar without date or place, but more than likely Rome, about 1520. In his dedication to Leo X he thanked the pontiff for making available to him the resources of the Vatican Library. At about this time Guidacerio unsuccessfully sought a position at the University of Avignon and a lectureship in the Collegium Trilingue at Leuven. In 1524 he published in Rome a commentary on the Song of Songs of Solomon, which he dedicated to Clement VII. He was probably a professor of Hebrew at the University of Rome at this date, not in 1514 as some sources have it, and he continued to borrow Hebrew books from the Vatican Library.⁵⁷ He left Rome after losing his library in the Sack of May 1527.

In 1530 Francis I appointed Guidacerio royal lecturer of Hebrew in Paris. He was one of the initial five lecturers in Greek and Hebrew, the nucleus of the Collège de France. In addition to teaching, Guidacerio in his Paris years published a Hebrew primer, grammar, glossary, and punctuation and pronunciation guide, the Hebrew text and Latin

work, pull together what is known about Guidacerio. Unfortunately, there is no DBI biography, and no detailed study of his biblical scholarship has been located.

⁵⁷ Galliner, "Guidacerius," pp. 86, 90; Pissavino, "Guidacerio," p. 149; and other sources state that Guidacerio was teaching Hebrew at the University of Rome in 1514. However, the roll of 1514 does not list a professorship of Hebrew nor Guidacerio in any capacity. Emanuele Conte, ed., *I maestri di Roma dal 1514 al 1787: I rotuli e altre fonti*, 1 (Rome, 1991), pp. 2–5. And there are no extant rolls between 1514 and 1535. But Galliner, "Guidacerius," p. 94, quotes two pieces of evidence that strongly suggest that Guidacerio was teaching at the University of Rome in 1524 and 1526. The first is a quote from the colophon of his commentary on the Song of Songs of 1524: "nuper edita per Agathium Clericum in Romana Academia linguae Hebraicae Graecae professorem eximum." The second is a quote from a Vatican Library register: "Ego Agathius lector Romani studii confiteor habuisse a custodibus bibliothecae de mandato Reverendissimi Brundusini librum Abenezza (*sic*) hebraicum super Psalterium hebraicum supra Job... die X julii 1526." The two expressions, "Romana Academia" and "lector Romani studii," are good, but not conclusive, evidence that he taught at the University of Rome, because contemporaries used a variety of terms for university, including "academia" and "studium." In addition, Renazzi, *Storia dell'Università di Roma*, 2, pp. 77–78, states that Guidacerio began to teach Hebrew at the University of Rome during the pontificate of Leo X, and that the pope greatly esteemed him. However, Renazzi gives no dates. According to Galliner, "Guidacerius," p. 94, the books that Guidacerio borrowed from the Vatican Library were Hebrew commentaries on the Psalms and Job by Abraham ibn Ezra (1089–1164).

translation of the Song of Songs and Ecclesiastes, and commentaries on several Psalms and the Sermon on the Mount.⁵⁸

Guidacerio dedicated his 1531 commentary on the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5:3–11) to Francis I and his queen, Eleanor of Portugal. It was based on the *Homilies on the Beatitudes* written in Greek by Gregory of Nyssa (c. 335–c. 395), the prolific Cappadocian Father.⁵⁹ Like its model, Guidacerio's work presented moral and spiritual exhortation. He did not offer any philological, historical, or grammatical discussion of Matthew's text, nor did he refer to patristic, medieval, or Renaissance commentators on the text, except for a passing reference to Augustine. The uncomplicated work may have been primarily intended for students. Guidacerio did include some personal and contemporary comments. In his discussion of the Eighth Beatitude (Blessed are they who suffer persecution for justice' sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven), Guidacerio mentioned his own "persecution," by which he meant his losses in the Sack of Rome and subsequent position, from which Francis I had rescued him. He also condemned "German heretics" and the "impious Luther."⁶⁰

Toward the end of the work Guidacerio abandoned the Beatitudes in order to plea for the study of Hebrew, which he repeatedly called "the sacred language." He believed that Hebrew could make an important contribution to theology. He rejoiced in the fact that Hebrew had been rescued from the hands of the Jews and brought to the notice of Christians. The study of Hebrew would help to rebuild the Church of Christ,

⁵⁸ Abel Lefranc, *Histoire du Collège de France depuis ses origines jusqu'à la fin du premier Empire* (Paris, 1893), pp. 113, 116–17, 131, 160, 181–82, 188, 381, 394, 395, 396, 398, 399, 402, 409–10, provides information, mostly salary payment records, about Guidacerio's Paris years. See the list of Guidacerio's works in Galliner, "Guidacerius," pp. 100–01. For a discussion of Guidacerio's Hebrew grammatical works, which were intended for his students, see André Tuilier, ed., *Histoire du Collège de France*. Vol. 1: *La Création (1530–1560)* (Paris, 2006), pp. 259–62, 265–69.

⁵⁹ *Ad Christianiss. Regem & Reginam Galliae Agathii Guidacerii in verba domini supra montem explanatio* (Paris: Excudebat Christianus Wechelus sub scuto Basiliensi, in vico Iacobaeo, 1531). I am grateful to Nelson Minnich for providing me with a photocopy of his copy of the book. It is a small duodecimo printing of 87 pages, but lacking pagination. Although it follows the general outline of Gregory's homilies, it is considerably shorter. For comparison see the English translation of Gregory of Nyssa's *Homilies on the Beatitudes* by Stuart George Hall in Hubertus R. Drobner and Albert Viciano, eds., *Gregory of Nyssa: Homilies on the Beatitudes. An English Version with Commentary and Supporting Studies. Proceedings of the Eighth International Colloquium on Gregory of Nyssa (Paderborn, 14–18 September 1998)* (Leiden, Boston, and Köln, 2000), pp. 21–90.

⁶⁰ Guidacerio, *Explanatio in verba Domini supra montem*, sigs. Bii verso, Biii recto, C recto, and F recto.

which would be of great benefit to France. An understanding of Hebrew would help Catholics to refute heretics who misinterpreted Holy Scripture. He predicted that a knowledge of Hebrew would enable French youths to become great theologians able to preach the most profound mysteries of the Christian faith and to confound Jews, Lutherans, and (other) heretics. Guidacerio urged Francis I to make sure that Hebrew lived not only in books but in the hearts of Frenchmen.⁶¹

Not everyone at the University of Paris agreed that the study of Hebrew aided theology. In January 1534 Noël Beda, the syndic of the Faculty of Theology, brought suit in the Parlement of Paris against Guidacerio and three other royal lecturers, Pierre Danès who taught Greek, and François Vatable and Paul Paradis who taught Hebrew. Beda charged that they lectured on the Bible without permission from the Faculty of Theology, which had sole jurisdiction over religious instruction.⁶² Beda's indictment gave precise information about Guidacerio's teaching. He taught in the Collège de Cambray, where he had announced that he would continue to lecture on Psalm 20. In addition, on Tuesdays one of his pupils would teach "the Hebrew alphabet" (the title of a Hebrew primer that Guidacerio published in 1533) and the grammar of Moses Kimhi. Beda charged that the royal lecturers were simply grammarians and rhetoricians with no expertise in theology who, nevertheless, criticized the Vulgate and interpreted Holy Scripture.

Both sides hired lawyers to argue their positions before the Parlement of Paris. Although it was a jurisdictional case, lawyers for Beda and the royal lecturers articulated some of the views of theologians and biblical humanists. Beda's lawyer argued that the royal lecturers did not understand theology and subverted the authority of the Vulgate Bible by pointing out textual differences found in Greek and Hebrew

⁶¹ Guidacerio, *Explanatio in verba Domini supra montem*, sigs. F verso–F iv recto.

⁶² There are several accounts of this well-known episode. The best is James K. Farge, *Le parti conservateur au XVI^e siècle: Université et Parlement de Paris à l'époque de la Renaissance et de la Réforme* (Paris, 1992), pp. 40–42, 117–31, who prints the documents with extensive notes. Unless otherwise indicated, this and the following paragraph are based on Farge. For Guidacerio's teaching, see *ibid.*, p. 119. Abel Lefranc, "Les commencements du Collège de France," in *Le Collège de France (1530–1930): Livre jubilaire composé à l'occasion de son quatrième centenaire* (Paris, 1932), pp. 32–34, 42–50 (whole article pp. 27–58), also prints documents. Brief summaries are found in Lefranc, *Histoire du Collège de France*, pp. 144–47; Galliner, "Guidacerius," pp. 97–98; and James K. Farge, *Orthodoxy and Reform in Early Reformation France: The Faculty of Theology of Paris, 1500–1543* (Leiden, 1985), pp. 205–06. See also James Farge's essay in this volume above, pp. 143–64.

manuscripts. They should not be permitted to criticize the Vulgate, which the Church had used for 1,100 years. This could only give aid and comfort to the Lutherans. The lawyer for the lecturers countered that they did not need approval from the Faculty of Theology, because their appointments came from the king, a higher authority. Moreover, they should be recognized as theologians because of their expertise in the ancient languages of the Bible. The Parlement agreed with Beda to the extent that it forbade the royal lecturers from criticizing the Vulgate. Guidacerio continued to teach and live in Paris until his death in 1540. When he died, the king gave his possessions to Guillaume Postel (1510–1581), a professor at the Collège de France since 1538, but claimed some of Guidacerio's Hebrew books and manuscripts for the royal library.⁶³

2. TWO CURIAL CARDINALS

The great Dominican Thomist Cardinal Tommaso de Vio (1469–1534), usually called Cajetan because he was born in Gaeta, became a prolific and independent-minded biblical humanist in the last eleven years of his life. Cajetan is well known as a Thomist philosopher and theologian and for his treatises responding to Luther. He was also master general of the Dominicans, participated in the Fifth Lateran Council, and undertook diplomatic missions to Germany. He is less known for his monumental biblical scholarship.

Cajetan joined the Dominican Order in 1484.⁶⁴ In 1494 he brilliantly defended theses against all comers, including Giovanni Pico, in a

⁶³ Lefranc, *Histoire du Collège de France*, pp. 160, 181–82, 188, 409–10; and Galliner, “Guidacerius,” p. 100.

⁶⁴ Useful studies of Cajetan include “F. Thomas de Vio Cajetanus,” in *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum*, 2, part 1, pp. 14–21; Eckehart Stöve, “De Vio, Tommaso,” in DBI 39, pp. 567–78; Jared Wicks, S.J., “Thomism Between Renaissance and Reformation: the Case of Cajetan,” *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 68 (1977), pp. 9–31; Jared Wicks, S.J., ed. and trans., *Cajetan Responds: A Reader in Reformation Controversy* (Washington, DC, 1978); Denis Janz, “Cajetan: A Thomist Reformer?” *Renaissance and Reformation/Renaissance et Réforme* 6 (1982), 94–102; Danilo Aguzzi-Barbagli, “Tommaso de Vio, Cardinal Cajetan,” in CEBR 1, pp. 239–42; and Jared Wicks, S.J., “Thomas de Vio Cajetan,” in Carter Lindberg, ed., *The Reformation Theologians: An Introduction to Theology in the Early Modern Period* (Oxford, 2002), pp. 269–83. Each contains much additional bibliography. This is only a small part of the enormous bibliography on Cajetan, much of which analyzes his philosophical and theological treatises and his encounters with Luther. Other works on his biblical scholarship will be cited below.

disputation during a general chapter meeting of the Dominicans. The master general immediately conferred a doctorate of theology on Cajetan, even though he had been a formal theological student for only a year. He later taught metaphysics and theology in the Dominican *studium* in Padua and the universities of Padua, Pavia, and Rome. As he reached high office in his order, he moved to Rome in 1500, where he spent the next twenty-four years, except for diplomatic missions and visits to Dominican monasteries. In his sermons at the papal court between 1501 and 1504, he emphasized man's dignity and referred to ancient non-Christian sources, clear evidence of humanist influence. Leo X made Cajetan a cardinal in 1517, and sent him as papal legate to Emperor Maximilian I and the Diet of Augsburg in an effort to garner support for a crusade against the Turks. As the pope's representative he examined Luther's writings and Luther himself at the Diet of Augsburg in October 1518, but failed to persuade him to recant his positions. Over his career Cajetan wrote numerous philosophical works in the Thomist tradition and learned defenses of Catholic doctrine and practices without engaging in excessive polemics. Then in the early 1520s he turned to the Bible. Scripture had always been important to Cajetan; now he undertook a vast program of biblical commentary.⁶⁵

In 1523 and 1524 Cajetan prepared his first biblical work, *Ientacula Novi Testamenti...praeclarissima sexagintaquatuor notabilium sententiarum Novi Testamenti literalis expositio* (Rome, 1525), which provided explanations of sixty-four passages in the New Testament. As the title indicates, Cajetan emphasized literal exposition. In the preface Cajetan wrote that he chose the texts randomly, which seems to be the case. They vary from major points of Christian revelation to what modern readers might see as minor puzzles. Cajetan often commented on the correct rendering of a word by pointing out that there were variants between the Greek and the Latin, or among Greek versions, or in the manuscripts.⁶⁶ He had

⁶⁵ O'Connor convincingly demonstrates the importance of Scripture in Cajetan's thought and his program of renewal for his order before and after 1518. Michael O'Connor, "A Neglected Facet of Cardinal Cajetan: Biblical Reform in High Renaissance Rome," in Richard Griffiths, ed., *The Bible in the Renaissance: Essays on Biblical Commentary and Translation in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries* (Aldershot, 2001), pp. 71–94, at 80–82, 90–93. It is based on O'Connor's unpublished doctoral dissertation, "Exegesis, Doctrine and Reform in the Biblical Commentaries of Cardinal Cajetan, 1469–1534" (Oxford University, 1997), not seen. We look forward to O'Connor's future studies.

⁶⁶ For example, in the discussion of Romans 1:4, Cajetan writes, "Tum propter varietatem textus apud Latinos & Graecos, & Graecos inter se, dum Latini codices communiter habent *Qui praedestinatus*." I cite the *Ientacula* from Thomas de Vio Caietanus,

begun to be a biblical humanist. And while Cajetan used the scholastic term *quaestio* for each textual discussion, the structure of the work is closer to the humanist form of philological *annotationes*, that is, a book consisting of interpretations and emendations of discrete passages found in various ancient authors.⁶⁷ Dedicated to Clement VII, the *Ientacula Novi Testamenti* was reprinted ten times in the sixteenth century.⁶⁸

A *ientaculum* is an “early meal” or “breakfast,” while *ientacula* may be translated as “snacks.”⁶⁹ Cajetan went on to prepare a feast of biblical scholarship. Because Clement VII made little use of his services, Cajetan moved to Gaeta, where he had been appointed bishop in 1519, in the second half of 1524 and remained there for the rest of his life except for brief trips. In Gaeta he threw himself into biblical scholarship, producing volume after volume of commentaries on the Bible. A methodical scholar, Cajetan usually concluded his commentary on a biblical book or group of books by noting the date, the place, and often his age upon completing a book. Publication followed. He published his exposition of the Psalms in Rome, 1527; the four Gospels in Venice, 1530; the Pauline and other Epistles in Venice, 1531; Acts in Rome, 1532; the Pentateuch in Rome, 1531, the historical books of the Old Testament in Rome, 1533; and Job in Rome, 1535. He then turned to the Prophets, but completed only the first three books of Isaiah before dying. He dedicated the volumes to Clement VII and Charles V, and constantly reiterated in his dedicatory letters that he was presenting the literal meaning.⁷⁰ Cajetan chose not to comment on Revelation and the Song of Songs because he did not believe that they could be rendered literally. Nor did he comment on the deuterocanonical books of the Old Testament (Maccabees, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Daniel, etc.), because he saw them as pietistical rather than as the story of Christ and his people.

Opera omnia quotquot in Sacrae Scripturae expositionem reperiuntur, 5 (1639, repr. Hildesheim, 2005), pp. 402–68, at p. 416A. A refers to column 1, B to column 2 on a page. All subsequent quotes from Cajetan’s biblical scholarship come from this edition.

⁶⁷ A good example of the humanist *annotationes* approach is Filippo Beroaldo the Elder, *Annotationes Centum*, ed. with introduction and commentary by Lucia A. Ciapponi (Binghamton, NY, 1995). It was first published in 1488. O’Connor, “Neglected Facet,” p. 93, first made the point about the similarity between Cajetan’s work and *annotationes*.

⁶⁸ Wicks, *Cajetan Responds*, p. 262, note 73.

⁶⁹ O’Connor, “Neglected Facet,” p. 92, offers the translation of “snacks.”

⁷⁰ The 1639 edition (Cajetan, *Opera omnia*) does not include dedicatory letters. However, I have examined several editions of Cajetan’s biblical works published in the 1530s and 1540s. See note 78 for three of them.

It was an extraordinary achievement. Eighteen printings of Cajetan's biblical commentaries appeared in the 1530s and 1540s, four more in the 1550s, and a handful after that.⁷¹ The collected edition of his biblical commentaries published in Lyon, 1639, consisted of 2,597 pages of double-columned folio-sized pages of text, another 209 pages of indices, and three pages of Cajetan's response to the censures of the Faculty of Theology of the University of Paris, making a total of 2,809 folio-sized pages.⁷²

Cajetan offered several reasons for his biblical commentaries. Like the other Italian biblical humanists, he studied the Psalms because they were essential to the liturgical life and prayers of the Church, especially for members of religious orders. Moreover, he wanted to help readers to understand fully the content of Scripture. He believed that there were many obscure points in the Bible that needed to be explained. Since not everyone who read the Bible had the ability to decipher obscure points, he offered a literal interpretation in order to help them. These reasons led to the larger goal, to help members of the clergy and lay people able to read Latin to understand better the Bible so that they might preach better, pray well, and live exemplary lives in the light of Scripture. He wanted to encourage renewal and reform in the Church, especially in the clergy, through fidelity to the teachings of Christ as seen in the Bible. Reform through a better understanding of Scripture was a theme of his exhortations to members of his own Order years before he began to write biblical commentaries.⁷³

⁷¹ I.-M. Vosté, O.P., "Cardinalis Caietanus sacrae scripturae interpres," *Angelicum* 40 (1934), 446–79 (whole article, pp. 445–513); and Stöve, "De Vio," p. 576.

⁷² Cajetan, *Opera omnia*.

⁷³ This paragraph is heavily based on O'Connor, "Neglected Facet," pp. 79–83. In addition to works already mentioned, see the following useful studies of Cajetan's biblical scholarship: Thomas Aquinas Collins, O.P., "The Cajetan Controversy," *American Ecclesiastical Review* 128 (1953), 90–100; Collins, "Cardinal Cajetan's Fundamental Biblical Principles," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 17 (1953), 363–78; especially A.F. von Gunten, "La contribution des 'Hébraux' à l'oeuvre exégétique de Cajétan," in Olivier Fatio and Pierre Fraenkel, eds., *Histoire de l'exégèse au XVI^e siècle* (Geneva, 1978), pp. 46–83; Vincent Carraud, "Métaphore et sens littéral selon Cajétan," in Bruno Pinchard and Saverio Ricci, eds., *Rationalisme analogique et humanisme théologique: La culture de Thomas de Vio 'Il Gaetano'* (Naples, 1993), pp. 183–207; and Allan K. Jenkins and Patrick Preston, *Biblical Scholarship and the Church. A Sixteenth-Century Crisis of Authority* (Aldershot, 2007), pp. 152–56. Because this work came to my attention only in December 2007, long after the article was submitted, I have not been able to take full advantage of it, especially the translations.

An older view, that Cajetan became a biblical scholar in order to refute Luther through Scripture, is not persuasive. The paucity of references to Protestants and their views proves the point: there are only four references to “Lutherans” in the 2,809 pages and only a handful of passages which refute contemporary Protestant views without naming their holders.⁷⁴ There are a few more references to ancient heresies and heretics, such as Arianism and Nestorius. But even these are only nibbles in his biblical feast. Moreover, Cajetan devoted little space to explaining scriptural support for Catholic beliefs and practices that Protestants disputed, such as Matthew 16:18–19 (You are Peter and upon this rock I will found my church).⁷⁵

To accomplish his purposes Cajetan embraced the *ad fontes* approach and adopted humanism’s critical attitude toward received opinion, in this case, the Vulgate text. But unlike the other Italian biblical humanists, who probably worked alone most or all of the time, Cajetan had help. He did humanistic biblical scholarship the way that Winston Churchill wrote history: Churchill produced his acclaimed six-volume history of World War II as the leader of a small group of historians, military experts, and secretaries.⁷⁶ In like manner, Cajetan had at least four assistants.

Two Hebrew scholars, one Jewish and the other Christian, helped Cajetan on the Old Testament.⁷⁷ It is likely that they were immensely

⁷⁴ O’Connor, “Neglected Facet,” pp. 72–78. Vosté, “Cardinales Caietanus,” pp. 505–07, also makes this point.

⁷⁵ Cajetan, *Opera omnia*, 4, pp. 75B–76B. See also Gunten, “La contribution des ‘Hébraux,’” pp. 57–58; Wicks, *Cajetan Responds*, p. 263, note 76; Wicks, “Cajetan,” p. 279; and O’Connor, “Neglected Facet,” p. 78, on the Matthew 16:18–19 passage. See Jenkins and Preston, *Biblical Scholarship*, pp. 244–47, for an English translation of Cajetan’s comment.”

⁷⁶ David Reynolds, *In Command of History* (New York, 2005). Churchill also had the help of the British government, which permitted him to keep for his own use and to quote documents unavailable to other scholars for many years. Churchill’s history was published between 1948 and 1954.

⁷⁷ “Et propterea assumpta illa, quae nomine B. Hieronymi circumfertur interpretatione iuxta Hebraicam veritatem & collata cum ea quae circumfertur nomine LXX. Interpretum & cum quatuor aliis modernis interpretationibus ex Hebraeo immediate, adhibui duos linguam Hebraeam scientes (alterum Hebraeum, magistrum linguae illius; alterum Christianum) cum pluribus vocabulariis linguae illius; & coram me (exigente significationes dictionum Hebraearum in lingua nostra Latina vel vulgari, & eligente significationem quae magis quadrare contextui visa est) feci per singula verba vocatam Beati Hieronymi interpretationem reduci ad respondendum Hebraeo textui de verbo ad verbum. Et sic conflata est nova isthaec interpretatio Psalmorum de verbo ad verbum consonans textui Hebraeo; quam exponere studui secundum sensum tantummodo literalem.” Proemium of Cajetan in *Liber Psalmorum ad verbum ex*

important contributors, just as Churchill's helpers wrote many passages in his books. But their names elude scholars. The identities of two other collaborators are known. The colophon of the *Ientacula*, plus colophons of the volumes on the Psalms, Gospels, and Epistles, indicate that "Ioannes Danielis" had "diligently revised," "reviewed," or "amended" the works.⁷⁸ Danielis was Jean Danielo, a clergyman from Rennes and holder of a canonry in Vannes, both in the archdiocese of Tours. He became a papal abbreviator (a person who produced a shortened form of a papal bull or decision, sent it out to be drafted, and then checked the final version for accuracy) in 1513 and held that position until he resigned it in 1538.⁷⁹ The colophons further identified Danielo as the holder of a position in the Sacred Penitentiary, the section of the Roman Curia which dealt with dispensations and the granting of favors and privileges, and indicate that he was a bachelor of theology. Most important, the colophons also described Danielo as a "familiarem" (member of the household) of Cajetan and "alumnum" (student) of Cajetan. He was obviously close to Cajetan. But whether he simply prepared the works for publication or did more is unknown.

Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda (c. 1490–1573), Greek scholar and chronicler of Charles V, also assisted Cajetan.⁸⁰ Sepúlveda was in Rome

Hebraeo versorum... ad litteram accuratissime enarratus, in Cajetan, *Opera omnia*, 3, pp. 1AB. This preface was first published in 1527. See Jenkins and Preston, *Biblical Scholarship*, p. 268, for a translation.

⁷⁸ "et per dominum Joannem Danielis sacre theologie baccalarius accuratius revise & correcte." Colophon of Cajetan, *Ientacula Novi Testamenti* (Lyon: per Joannem Crespinum, impensis Jacobi q. Francisci de Giuncta, 1530). "per Ioannem Danielis pp. ('papae') poenitentiarium ac authoris operis familiarem accuratissime recognita." Cajetan, *Psalmi Davidici ad Hebraicam veritatem castigati: & iuxta sensum quem literalem dicunt enarrati* (Paris: Aere & accuratione I. Badii, I. Parvi & I. Roigni, 1532). "per Ioannem Danielis S(ummi) D(omini) N(ostri). pp. poenitentiarium ac authoris alumnum diligenter recognitorum." Cajetan, *Evangelia cum commentariis... in quatuor Evangelia & Acta apostolorum ad Grecorum codicum veritatem castigata* (Paris: Apud Iod. Badium Ascensium & Ioan. Parvum & Ioannem Roigny, 1532). This is repeated in Cajetan, *Opera omnia*, 4, p. 484. "per Ioannem Danielis S. D. N. pp. poenitentiarium & authoris operis familiarem summo studio recognitorum." Cajetan, *Epistolae Pauli et aliorum apostolorum ad Grecam veritatem castigate* (Paris: Apud Iod. Badium Ascensium & Ioan. Parvum & Ioannem Roigny, 1532).

⁷⁹ For Danielo, see Thomas Frenz, *Die Kanzlei der Päpste der Hochrenaissance (1471–1527)* (Tübingen, 1986), pp. 250, 252, 371 (# 1227), 475. I thank Nelson Minnich for identifying Danielo. For the duties of abbreviators, see *ibid.*, pp. 208–10; and John F. D'Amico, *Renaissance Humanism in Papal Rome: Humanists and Churchmen on the Eve of the Reformation* (Baltimore, 1983), pp. 26, 29.

⁸⁰ Sepúlveda had a long and illustrious career in Italy and Spain. Although he may be best known for defending the Spanish conquest of the New World and subjugation of the Indians against Bartolomé de las Casas, he wrote many other works. See

translating works of Aristotle and ancient Greek commentaries on Aristotle for Clement VII when imperial troops sacked Rome in May 1527. He eventually escaped to Naples but was trapped there as the French besieged the city from May to September 1528. At that moment Cajetan invited Sepúlveda to come to Gaeta to assist him. Since the French did not control the sea, a boat brought Sepúlveda to Gaeta sometime in 1528, probably in the summer. Because Cajetan had no Greek, according to Sepúlveda, he assisted the cardinal in deciphering difficult Greek passages in the New Testament.⁸¹ Sepúlveda left Cajetan in order to serve the Spanish Cardinal Francisco Quiñones (c. 1475/80–1540), probably in Rome, sometime in 1529, but definitely before early August 1529.⁸² Hence, Sepúlveda helped Cajetan for perhaps six months, possibly a year. In those months Cajetan wrote his commentaries on the Epistles (except for Romans) and Acts.⁸³

Cajetan explained his working methods in the preface to his psalm commentary.⁸⁴ Aware that the Psalms were written in Hebrew, he

Aubrey F.G. Bell, *Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda* (Oxford, 1925); and Arsenio Pacheco, "Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda," in CEBR 3, pp. 240–42. He was also a friend and defender of Alberto Pio against Erasmus. See CWE 84, index.

⁸¹ "Ad quam urbem (Gaeta) ego tunc temporis aderam cum Thoma Vio cardinale, viro singulari religione et theologica doctrina claro. Nam post urbis Romae direptionem is Caietam urbem patriam, cuius etiam ecclesiae antistes erat, ego Neapolim me receperam, unde ab ipso studiorum gratia inter initia belli huius sum evocatus, ut ex sacra Novi Testamenti scriptura, quam scripto tunc enarrabat, obscura et ancipitia loca ad normam Graecam me adhibito (nec enim ipse Graece noverat) dirigeret ac explanaret." Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda, *Obras completas*. Vols. 1 and 2: *Historia de Carlos V*, 2, ed. and trans. E. Rodríguez Peregrina, annotated by B. Cuat Moner (Pozoblanco, 1995–1996), p. 64 (bk. VIII, 16). See also Bell, *Sepúlveda*, p. 7.

⁸² Sepúlveda wrote that he became a member of the household of Cardinal Quiñones and accompanied him to Genoa to meet Charles V on 12 August 1529. Sepúlveda, *Obras completas*, 2, p. 85 (bk. IX, 7). See also Bell, *Sepúlveda*, p. 8. Although it is not known when Sepúlveda entered the service of Quiñones, Pastor, *The History of the Popes*, 10, p. 35, records that the cardinal returned to Rome from a diplomatic mission to Charles V on 30 December 1528. Hence, it appears that Sepúlveda left Cajetan to serve Quiñones in Rome sometime between January and August 1529. For Quiñones, see Milagros Rivera & PGB, "Francisco de Quiñones," in CEBR 3, pp. 125–26.

⁸³ Cajetan noted that he finished the Gospels at Gaeta on 16 May 1528. Cajetan, *Opera omnia*, 4, p. 430B. He finished all the Epistles (except for Romans, which he did not complete until 1532) between October 1528 and 10 July 1529, and Acts on 29 June 1529, always at Gaeta. Cajetan, *Opera omnia*, 4, p. 484B; *ibid.*, 5, pp. 151B, 199B, 220B, 245B, 258B, 274B, 284B, 290B, 307B, 319B, 326B, 328B, 361B, 370B, 387B. This also gives an idea of how quickly Cajetan worked. I have not found any reference to Sepúlveda in these works.

⁸⁴ See the Proemium in Cajetan, *Opera omnia*, 3, p. 1AB, which includes the section quoted in note 77. See Jenkins and Preston, *Biblical Scholarship*, pp. 267–72, for a translation.

compared Jerome's Vulgate with the Hebrew Bible (*Hebraica veritas*), the Greek Septuagint, and four modern versions directly based on the Hebrew. They may have been the Hebrew-Latin and polyglot editions of Felice da Prato, Agostino Giustiniani, and Santi Pagnini, plus an unknown fourth. Then he consulted the two Hebrew experts and with the aid of glossaries they discussed in his presence ("coram me") the meaning of the Hebrew word in Latin and the vernacular. Cajetan's goal was to interpret the Psalms "de verbo ad verbum consonans textui Hebraeo," that is, to create a word-for-word translation that would conform to the Hebrew and give the literal sense of the passage.

Cajetan presented side-by-side two Latin translations of each Psalm, the Vulgate and his Latin translation *iuxta Hebraeum*, which often read quite differently. Then Cajetan announced the subject matter of the Psalm and gave a brief summary of its content. Next came a painstakingly thorough explanation of the exact meaning of each word or line based on the Latin *iuxta Hebraeum* translation.

Cajetan presented literal word-for-word translations even when they read awkwardly. For example, the Vulgate of Psalm 1:1 reads "Beatus vir qui non abiit in consilio impiorum & in via peccatorum non stetit, & in cathedra pestilentiae non sedit." (Blessed is the man who has not departed into the council of the impious, and has not stood on the path of sinners, and has not sat on the plague-seat.) Cajetan's Latin translation *iuxta Hebraeum* reads "Beatitudines viri qui non ambulavit in consilio impiorum, & in via peccatorum non stetit, & in sede derisorum non sedit." (The beatitudes of the man who does not walk in the counsel of the impious and has not stood in the path of sinners and has not sat in the seat of the scoffers.) He argued that the Hebrew supported the plural "men," but one should also understand a singular meaning. He explained that there were two kinds of happiness, in this life and in the future life, which helps to explain the plural "beatitudes." And so on. A little later he also explained that "viri" does not exclude women.⁸⁵

⁸⁵ See Cajetan, *Opera omnia*, 3, pp. 1–503 for the Psalm commentary, p. 5AB for the two Latin versions quoted, and pp. 5A–8B for his commentary on Psalm 1. Cajetan has added "sunt" between "Beatitudines" and "viri" in small type slightly above the line. "Catheata" of the Vulgate on p. 5A is an obvious typographical error and has been corrected. The English translation of verse 1 of the Vulgate given here is that of Michael J. Heath in CWE 63, p. 5. Gunten, "La contribution des 'Hébreux,'" has much information about the psalm commentaries. Incidentally, Pagnini in his Psalter of 1521 also favored "Beatitudines viri" on the authority of David Kimhi. Morisi

Thus, Cajetan explained grammar and presented very literal explanations of the meaning. He identified names and provided historical and geographical information. And he offered the usual Christian interpretations of the messianic Psalms. He avoided as much as possible allegorical, tropological (moral), and anagogical (mystical) interpretations.

In his commentaries on other books of the Bible Cajetan did not offer complete new Latin translations of entire books. But he did give an enormous number of new translations differing from the Vulgate for individual words and passages. Again and again he used such phrases as “iuxta Hebreum habetur,” or “dictio Hebraïca,” or “non habetur hoc in Hebreo,” in order to explain his use of a different word than that found in the Vulgate.⁸⁶ He referred to variant readings found in “old Hebrew manuscripts.”⁸⁷ And he frequently inserted into his explanation Hebrew words in Hebrew font.⁸⁸ He clearly viewed Jerome’s Vulgate as needing considerable revision, if not outright replacement. Cajetan and his collaborators undoubtedly used a variety of Jewish and Christian scholarly sources but did not name them. And he cited very few other commentators and made very few references to the Fathers and medieval scholastic authorities, not even to his revered Thomas Aquinas. As Cajetan repeatedly stated in his prefaces to individual volumes, his goal was to present a full and accurate but very literal understanding of the Bible without the benefit of commentaries or too much interpretation.

In his commentary on the New Testament Cajetan offered new readings based on the Greek (“in Graeco habetur”), although not nearly so often as he made corrections based on the Hebrew in the Old Testament.⁸⁹ And he did not include Greek words in Greek fonts. Unfortunately, Cajetan did not provide information about his working

Guerra, “Santi Pagnini traduttore de la Bible,” p. 36. This suggests that Cajetan and his collaborators either used Pagnini’s work or went back to Kimhi.

⁸⁶ For example, there are thirteen such phrases on a single page in his commentary on Esther 2:1–15. Cajetan, *Opera omnia*, 2, p. 393AB.

⁸⁷ “antiqui codices Hebraeorum habent *filij Meseh*; moderni habent *Menasseh*.” Cajetan, *Opera omnia*, 2, p. 65B. The passage discussed is from Judges 18:30 and concerns the correct names of the son of Jonathan. Gunten, “La contribution des Hébreux,” p. 73, note 54, also mentions this passage.

⁸⁸ See, for example, Cajetan, *Opera omnia*, 1, pp. 1AB, 2AB, 4B, 6B, 7AB, 8A, 9AB, 10AB, 11AB, etc., in his commentary on Genesis.

⁸⁹ See, for example, Cajetan, *Opera omnia*, 4, pp. 9AB, 10A, 102A, 121A, 282A, 286B, 441B. These references are the result of a random search in only a single volume. Undoubtedly, there are many more.

methods for the New Testament books. Nor did he indicate which Greek text he used, although one modern scholar has concluded that it was that of Erasmus.⁹⁰ However, he did not always follow Erasmus; his departures from the Vulgate were sometimes the same as those of Erasmus but often different.⁹¹

Cajetan was bold, confident, and independent in his judgments, especially in his comments concerning what he saw as mistakes in the Vulgate. And he took many controversial positions on other matters, especially about the canon of Scripture. In his commentary on the Book of Esther he wrote that the Hebrew text ended with chapter ten, and that the following six or seven chapters were apocryphal. He also rejected Judith, Tobias, and Maccabees 1 and 2, the Book of Wisdom, and Ecclesiastes.⁹² In the New Testament he expressed doubts about whether Paul was the author of the letter to the Hebrews, and he questioned the canonicity of the Epistles of James, Jude, and John 1 and 2.⁹³ He did not think that John 8:3–11 was authentic.⁹⁴ This was the story of the adulteress about to be stoned to death. Jesus saves her by saying “Let him who is without sin among you cast the first stone,” and then telling her to go and sin no more. Nevertheless, Cajetan did comment on this passage in his usual careful, literal, and historical fashion, including mentioning Mosaic law.

⁹⁰ Stöve, “De Vio,” p. 575.

⁹¹ See the sampling of comparisons between the Vulgate, Cajetan, Lefèvre d’Étaples, and Erasmus for individual words and short phrases in their New Testament works in Vosté, “Cardinalis Caietanus,” pp. 466–71. Cajetan offers readings that are the same as those of Erasmus about half of the time. He differs with Lefèvre d’Étaples, who usually retained the Vulgate, far more often.

⁹² “...terminatur liber Esther iuxta Hebraicam veritatem. Ita quod sex seu septem sequentia capitula sunt apocrypha: et propterea non exponemus illa. Et hoc in loco terminamus commentaria librorum Historialium veteris Testamenti: nam reliqui (videlicet Judith, Tobiae et Maccabaeorum libri) a divo Hieronymo extra canonicos libros supputantur, et inter apocrypha locantur, cum libro Sapientiae et Ecclesiastico: ut patet in prologo galeato.” Cajetan, *Opera omnia*, 2, p. 400B.

⁹³ For Cajetan’s discussion of the canonicity of Hebrews, see Cajetan, *Opera omnia*, 5, pp. 329AB–330A. Vosté, “Cardinalis Caietanus,” pp. 451–58, 483–85; and Ulrich Horst, “Der Streit um die Heilige Schrift zwischen Kardinal Cajetan und Ambrosius Catharinus,” in Leo Scheffczyk, Werner Dettloff, and Richard Heinzmann, eds., *Wahrheit und Verkündigung: Michael Schmaus zum 70. Geburtstag*, 1 (Munich, 1967), pp. 559–68 (whole article pp. 551–77), summarize well Cajetan’s canon questioning.

⁹⁴ “Adverte quod haec prima pars huius capituli cum tota historia adulterae, non est omnino authentica: quoniam non constat ipsam esse partem Evangelij.” Cajetan, *Opera omnia*, 4, p. 345A. His comment follows on p. 345AB.

In the course of his commentaries Cajetan opined that vernacular languages might be useful in worship services and that divine law might permit divorce and remarriage. Moreover, he stated that reason could not demonstrate the immortality of the soul, a position grudgingly permitted by the bull *Apostolici regiminis sollicitudo* issued by the Fifth Lateran Council on 19 December 1513, but unpopular and held by very few, if any, clergymen.⁹⁵ Overall, Cajetan expressed so many unconventional views that a nineteenth-century English Protestant scholar praised his biblical scholarship. He believed that Cajetan was on the right road, the one that led to Protestantism, and regretted that the cardinal had had no influence on the Council of Trent, the point at which the Catholic Church had gone irredeemably wrong, in the opinion of this scholar.⁹⁶

Conservative theologians did not like what Cajetan wrote. In 1532 the Faculty of Theology of the University of Paris examined his commentaries on the Psalms and the New Testament with the intention of censuring them. However, Clement VII demanded that they send a copy of their censures to Rome and forbade the faculty from taking action without his permission. Nevertheless, in May 1533 the Faculty condemned twenty-four propositions. Jean de Gaigny, the dean of the faculty, drafted a letter to accompany the list of censures and proposed that it be sent to the pope and Cajetan. In his letter Gaigny denounced Cajetan for commenting on the Bible despite his ignorance of Hebrew and inadequate knowledge of Greek, and for abandoning the Vulgate for new and faulty editions and translations.⁹⁷ Whether or not the letter was sent is unknown; but a copy was leaked, and the censures and the letter were published in Wittenberg.⁹⁸ Cajetan responded to sixteen of

⁹⁵ Wicks, *Cajetan Responds*, pp. 37 and 263, notes 84 and 85. Cajetan was one of only two council fathers who voted against *Apostolici regiminis sollicitudo* at the Fifth Lateran Council.

⁹⁶ Robert C. Jenkins, *Pre-Tridentine Doctrine. A Review of the Commentary on the Scriptures of Thomas De Vio, Cardinal of St. Xystus, commonly called Cardinal Cajetan* (London, 1891). Despite his anti-Catholic views, Jenkins provides a good overview of Cajetan's biblical commentaries.

⁹⁷ How much knowledge Cajetan had of Greek and Hebrew remains unresolved. As indicated above, Sepúlveda wrote that Cajetan had no Greek. Modern scholars are not sure. Gunten, "La contribution des 'Hébreux,'" p. 64, concludes that he was ignorant of both languages. Collins, "Cajetan's Biblical Principles," p. 365, states that "he was not very skilled in Hebrew." Other scholars take no position.

⁹⁸ Farge, *Orthodoxy and Reform*, pp. 180, 231–32. See also Collins, "The Cajetan Controversy;" and the short summary in Wicks, *Cajetan Responds*, pp. 36–38.

the censures in a short and angry letter of 30 December 1533, not to the Faculty, but to another Dominican.⁹⁹

Things changed in 1534. Cajetan died on 10 August and Clement VII, his supporter, on 25 September. Then, as now, critics find it easier to attack dead scholars than live ones. Ambrogio Catarino Politi (secular name Lancellotto de' Politi, 1484–1553), a fellow Dominican with doctorates in civil and canon law, made a career of denouncing various Protestants and Catholics who deviated from what he saw as true doctrine. In 1535 he published a condemnation of the biblical scholarship of Cajetan. Politi disliked everything. He criticized Cajetan for departing from Jerome's Vulgate: Jerome wrote it one way, Cajetan another, and Cajetan was wrong. He attacked Cajetan for relying on the Hebrew text and for introducing variants based on the Greek. He rejected Cajetan's views on the canon, especially his doubts about the Epistle to the Hebrews. He questioned Cajetan's literal interpretations, protested that Cajetan paid little attention to the mystical sense of Scripture, and that he did not interpret all the Psalms in a Christological way. He criticized Cajetan's views on the conception of Mary and invoked Pelagius in his criticism of Cajetan's views on the sacrament of penance. He condemned Cajetan for ignoring the views of so many holy and learned commentators. He even charged that Cajetan was not a good Thomist. The repeated printed marginal notation, "inconstantia doctrinae," underscored the message of the book. Politi's summary judgment was that the cardinal's views were "not only against all the theologians and saints, but also against reason and the words of the text."¹⁰⁰ Catarino added some criticism of the biblical scholarship of

⁹⁹ Cajetan's *responsio* in the form of a letter to "Ioanni Regenti Maguntini," i.e., Johannes Dietenberger, regent in the Dominican *studium* at Mainz, was included in editions of Cajetan's works in the later sixteenth century and in Cajetan, *Opera omnia*, 5, pp. 469–71. For a critical edition with excellent notes of Cajetan's *responsio*, see James K. Farge, ed., *Registre des conclusions de la Faculté de Théologie de l'Université de Paris*, 2 (Paris, 1994), pp. 427–34. The place and date of the letter is Rome, 30 December 1534. Either the year was a mistake, or Cajetan used Nativity-style dating, in which the new year begins on 25 December. It was in limited use in Rome at this time. See A. Capelli, *Cronologia, Cronografia e Calendario Perpetuo dal principio dell'era cristiana ai nostri giorni*, 5th ed. (Milan, 1983), p. 15. For an English translation, see Jenkins and Preston, *Biblical Scholarship*, pp. 273–77.

¹⁰⁰ "...non solum contra omnes theologos & sanctos, verum etiam contra rationem & verba illius textum." I cite the second edition: *F. Ambrosij Catharini Politi Senensis Ord. Praed. Annotationes in Commentaria Caietani denuo multo locupletiores & castigatiores redditae* (Lyon: Apud Mathiam Bonhomme, 1542), p. 491. It is a work of 586 pages plus index in a duodecimo format. Horst, "Der Streit zwischen Cajetan und Catharinus," pp. 568–77,

Erasmus, which was a way of linking Cajetan to another humanist who meddled in theology. The Faculty of Theology of the University of Paris endorsed Politi's attack and censured anew passages from Cajetan's New Testament commentaries in 1544. The Faculty continued to find fault with his scriptural scholarship and other works through 1547.¹⁰¹

Cajetan was a scholastic philosopher and theologian who became a humanist biblical scholar. In so doing he followed a scholarly path similar to that of the medical humanists of the Renaissance. Nicolò Leonicensio (1428–1524), Andreas Vesalius (1514–1564), and other medical humanists trained in medicine; they studied medieval medical texts and imbibed medieval scholastic approaches to them. But they also acquired humanistic linguistic skills and cultivated the humanists' critical attitude toward received wisdom. They began to look skeptically at medieval medical texts and, above all, they used their humanistic skills to make new translations from Galen's Greek, with the aid of manuscripts that they had uncovered. This led them to look at the human body with fresh eyes and to make original medical discoveries that left medieval medicine, and eventually even Galen, behind.¹⁰² In like manner, Cajetan received scholastic training and followed Thomas Aquinas. But late in life he embraced the emphasis on original sources of the humanists and, always something of an iconoclast, their critical attitude. Cajetan lacked adequate linguistic skills to do humanistic biblical scholarship on his own, so he found experts in Hebrew and Greek to help him produce his own literal interpretation of the Bible. Cajetan looked at the received text of the Bible with fresh, critical eyes and reached judgments that dismayed some of his fellow theologians.

The papal secretary and cardinal Jacopo Sadoletto (1477–1547) also became a biblical humanist relatively late in his career. Born in Ferrara, he attended the University of Ferrara, then went to Rome in 1498 or 1499 to continue his humanistic training in the household of Cardinal Oliviero Carafa and to rise in the world of letters and in the

provides a summary of the chief criticisms. For a brief biography of Catarino, see Ilse Guenther, "Lancelotto de' Politi," in CEBR 3, pp. 105–06. Erika Rummel, *Erasmus and His Catholic Critics*, 2 (Nieuwkoop, 1989), pp. 128–34, summarizes Politi's attacks on Erasmus. For more on Politi's views on Scripture and attacks on Cajetan, see Jenkins and Preston, *Biblical Scholarship*, pp. 149–51, 156–58, 161–72, 247, 281–99.

¹⁰¹ See Farge, ed., *Registre des conclusions*, 2, pp. 47, 277–78, 363–64, 366, and 435–40.

¹⁰² See Paul F. Grendler, *The Universities of the Italian Renaissance* (Baltimore, 2002), pp. 314–52, for a brief summary of medical humanism and its impact.

Church.¹⁰³ Leo X appointed Sadoletto and Pietro Bembo papal secretaries in March 1513; as secretary he drafted official documents and letters in elegant Latin for the pope to sign and wielded influence. In addition, Leo appointed him bishop of Carpentras in papal territory in southern France in 1517. After a hiatus during the pontificate of Adrian VI when Sadoletto held no significant office, Clement VII again appointed him papal secretary and gave him even more responsibility than he had under Leo X. But weary of curial life and foreseeing disaster as the outcome of Clement's diplomacy, Sadoletto left Rome for Carpentras two weeks before the Sack, which began on 6 May 1527. He was a full-time scholar and reforming bishop in his diocese from 1527 to 1536, the happiest years of his life. Called back to Rome in November 1536 and made a cardinal in December 1536, he worked for church reform, conciliation with the Protestants, and the coming council, which he did not attend. He escaped again to Carpentras in 1538, but undertook a diplomatic mission for Paul III in 1543 and returned to Rome in 1545, where he died in 1547.

Sadoletto wrote five works of biblical exegesis. He published his commentary on Psalm 50 (*Miserere mei Deus*) in Rome, 1525, followed by six more printings through 1537.¹⁰⁴ While at Carpentras he prepared a commentary on Psalm 93 which was published at Lyon, 1530, followed by four more printings through 1537.¹⁰⁵ In 1533, at the request of Clement VII, he wrote a fifty-one-page commentary on two passages in the Gospel of John (3:1–23, 20:17) which dealt with being born again in the spirit in order to achieve salvation and Jesus' future

¹⁰³ For his life, see Richard M. Douglas, *Jacopo Sadoletto 1477–1547: Humanist and Reformer* (Cambridge, Mass., 1959); and Douglas, "Jacopo Sadoletto," *CEBR* 3, pp. 183–87.

¹⁰⁴ *Jacobi Sadoleti... Interpretatio in Psalmum, Miserere mei Deus*. The editions were Rome, 1525 and 1531; Hagenau, 1526; Lyon 1528, 1533, and 1537; and no place, 1532. It was reprinted in Jacopo Sadoletto, *Opera quae extant omnia*, 3 (1738, repr. Ridgewood, NJ, 1964), pp. 262–93. See S. Ritter, *Un umanista teologo Jacopo Sadoletto (1477–1547): In appendice il trattato inedito di Sadoletto De peccato originali* (Rome, 1912), p. 48, note 1; and Gerd Gesigora, *Ein humanistischer Psalmenexegese des 16. Jahrhunderts: Jacopo Sadoletto (1477–1547): Paradigmatische Studien zur Hermeneutik und Psalmenexegese des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Frankfurt am Main, 1997), p. 37, for a list of editions. In addition to his biblical commentaries, Sadoletto wrote several other works on philosophy and pedagogy, plus an open letter to the senate and people of Geneva calling for reconciliation. These will not be discussed.

¹⁰⁵ *Jacobi Sadoleti... in Psalmum XCIII, Deus ultionum Dominus; Interpretatio*. The subsequent printings were Basel 1530; and Lyon 1533, 1534, and 1537. It was reprinted in Sadoletto, *Opera*, 3, pp. 294–376. See Ritter, *Sadoletto*, p. 50; and Gesigora, *Sadoletto*, p. 40, for the list of editions.

resurrection. It was not published until 1839.¹⁰⁶ At about the same time he wrote *In locum Evangelicum de duobus gladiis interpretatio*, dedicated to Francis I of France. It was a very short work connecting Isaiah 53, in which Isaiah rebuked the Jews for their wickedness and infidelity to God, with Mark 15:28, which invoked Isaiah in the midst of the account of the crucifixion, and Luke 22:35–39, which also referred to Isaiah when Jesus told his disciples to be prepared for all dangers, and one disciple responded that he had two swords. It was not published in Sadoletto's lifetime.¹⁰⁷

In his Psalm exegesis Sadoletto differed considerably from the other Italian biblical humanists of his era, including Cajetan, in his attitude toward Hebrew. Sadoletto knew little if any Hebrew and had little respect for the Hebrew text of the Bible and Jewish scholarship. He contrasted Christian piety and Jewish piety, criticizing the latter. In Sadoletto's view, Jewish law and Jewish cultural practices kept Jews from accepting Christ. Nevertheless, he viewed the Jewish prophets, including David, as "hidden" Christians.¹⁰⁸

Sadoletto's basic text was Jerome's Gallican Psalter, which was incorporated into the Vulgate. However, he often criticized and changed Jerome's Vulgate when he felt that the early-Christian-era Greek commentaries supported corrections. And he relied on the Greek Septuagint, which he knew was a translation from the Hebrew, in order to correct the Vulgate. For example, in his comment on Psalm 93:15b, he opted for a word because it came from the Septuagint "in which we have the greatest faith."¹⁰⁹ He also had a manuscript copy of a Greek Psalter.¹¹⁰ And he used Jerome's *Psalterium iuxta Hebraeos* or Hebrew Psalter, which was Jerome's translation from Hebrew texts. Although he had little patience with medieval scholars, he occasionally relied on

¹⁰⁶ Angelo Mai, ed., *Iacobi Sadoleti Episcopi Carpentoractis in duo Iohannis loca de Nicodemo et de Magdalena in Spicilegium Romanum*, 2 (Rome, 1839), pp. 179–230.

¹⁰⁷ See Sadoletto, *Opera*, 4, pp. 377–90.

¹⁰⁸ Gesigora calls Sadoletto's views "theological anti-Judaism." Gesigora, *Sadoletto*, pp. 121–26, and the notes on pp. 375–86.

¹⁰⁹ "Et qui tenent eam omnes recto sunt corde. Graece enim ex Hebraeo expressum a Septuaginta, quibus nos maximam fidem habemus." Sadoletto, *Opera*, 3, p. 336A. Because each page has two columns, A and B are used to designate columns 1 and 2 when necessary. Gesigora, *Sadoletto*, p. 115, also quotes this passage.

¹¹⁰ Giovanni Cardinal Mercati, "Un salterio greco e una catena greca del salterio posseduti dal Sadoletto," in *Miscellanea Pio Paschini: Studi di storia ecclesiastica*, 2 (Rome, 1949), pp. 205–11.

Nicholas of Lyra (c. 1270–1349), who used Hebrew texts.¹¹¹ So far as can be determined, Sadoletto did not use the translations of Felice da Prato, Giustiniani, or Pagnini.

For Sadoletto the most important sources from which to learn about the Psalms were the Greek Fathers who wrote commentaries on them, including, but not limited to, Symmachus, a second-century translator of the Bible from Hebrew into Greek; Origen; Athanasius of Alexandria (c. 295–373); Basil the Great; John Chrysostom (348–407), bishop of Constantinople; and Theodoret of Cyrus (c. 393–c. 457). Sadoletto also followed the Latin Augustine; Arnobius (d. after 451), a semi-Pelagian Latin whose *Commentarii in Psalmos* attacked Augustine's theory of predestination; Cassiodorus; and a few other ancient works including one attributed to Ambrose, plus a Byzantine text. He preferred these "old theologians" to the scholastics because of their knowledge of ancient philosophies and good arts, their nearness to the time of the New Testament, their sanctity of life, and their inspiration from God.¹¹²

Sadoletto was a humanist in his biblical exegesis. For Sadoletto the Old Testament was the history of God's people; hence, the first duty of the exegete was to make clear what happened as the text described it. To do this Sadoletto had considerable confidence in his own abilities to understand and elucidate Scripture without relying on theological experts and ecclesiastical tradition. Indeed, he often dismissed scholastic exegesis with such words as "inaccurate and confused" and "barbarous and vile language."¹¹³ He charged that their works had nothing to do with true piety and were unable to inflame souls to love God. Sadoletto believed that the exegete had the duty to use the text to move souls and to help them to believe more fully, a belief that he shared with his friend Erasmus. Exegesis had a homiletic purpose and nature; consequently, the exegete should combine biblical message, elegant Latin, and rhetorical devices. Hence, Sadoletto employed prayerful interjections, metaphors, and rhetorical questions and his Psalm exegesis was more moral than theological.¹¹⁴ It was freer and more literary than that of the other Italian biblical humanists.

¹¹¹ Gesigora, *Sadoletto*, pp. 128–43, 392–96.

¹¹² Gesigora, *Sadoletto*, pp. 85–98, 102–22, and the notes on pp. 337–46, 351–60.

¹¹³ Gesigora, *Sadoletto*, p. 437, note 43, quotes several of Sadoletto's sharp comments about the scholastics in which he used words such as "inaccurato et incondito" and "barbara et lutulenta lingua."

¹¹⁴ Gesigora, *Sadoletto*, pp. 155–63 and 432–41.

Next came his most important biblical work, *Commentariorum in Pauli Epistolam ad Romanos libri tres*, published in Lyon, 1535, followed by three more printings in 1536 and 1537.¹¹⁵ The debate on free will between Erasmus and Luther may have inspired him to take up his pen, because he wished to present a position on justification that would refute Luther. Sadoletto believed that the Lutherans had taken advantage of a general lack of knowledge of Greek to lead readers into error. So he decided to render Paul's thought from Greek into Latin and to explain it as exactly as possible in order to deny the Lutherans one of their weapons, namely, the accusation that Catholics used bad translations and did not understand Paul properly.¹¹⁶ Sadoletto began work on it in the early 1530s.

The work is a dialogue that supposedly occurred during Pentecost in 1525. The speakers were Sadoletto and his brother Giulio in books one and two, which dealt with justification. For book three, which discussed moral questions, including relationships between superiors, equals, and inferiors; fasting; and religious orders, he added two more speakers, Cardinal Agostino Trivulzio (made cardinal 1517; died 1548), friend, scholar, and protector of French interests in Rome, and another friend, Cardinal Jean du Bellay (1498–1560), bishop of Paris and diplomat for the French king.¹¹⁷

Sadoletto set a humanistic tone by writing that he was sitting in the garden of his Roman residence on the Quirinale Hill on the feast of Pentecost with a copy of Paul's epistles in Greek in his hand.¹¹⁸ One suspects that it was Erasmus' Greek-Latin New Testament edition. Sadoletto referred fairly often to Greek texts; he lightly sprinkled Greek words throughout and used them to correct the Vulgate, as he had done in his other biblical works.¹¹⁹ On at least one occasion Sadoletto

¹¹⁵ The printings were Venice 1536, and Lyon 1536 and 1537. Ritter, *Sadoletto*, pp. 61–62, note 5. It occupies all of Sadoletto, *Opera*, 4, which reprints the first edition without the minor changes that Sadoletto introduced into the second edition.

¹¹⁶ Douglas, *Sadoletto*, p. 81.

¹¹⁷ Douglas, *Sadoletto*, pp. 80–86, summarizes the work. For a brief biography of Du Bellay, see Michel Reulos & PGB, "Jean Du Bellay," in CEBR 1, p. 407; for Trivulzio, see Rosemary Devonshire Jones, "Agostino Trivulzio," in CEBR 3, pp. 345–46.

¹¹⁸ Sadoletto, *Opera*, 4, p. 8A.

¹¹⁹ Sadoletto, *Opera*, 3, p. 270A (*In Psalmum Miserere mei Deus*); pp. 299A, 336AB, 356A–357B (*In Psalmum XCIII*); p. 377AB (*In locum evangelicum de duobus gladiis*); and *ibid.*, 4, pp. 8A, 10B, 24A, 192AB, 360B–61A, and elsewhere (*Commentarioum... ad Romanos*). This is only a sampling, not a complete list.

corrected a Vulgate reading according to a Latin codex.¹²⁰ As in his Psalm commentaries, Sadoletto avoided medieval and contemporary scholastic authors, preferring the Greek and Latin Fathers, especially John Chrysostom. He disagreed with Augustine on the roles of divine grace and human merit in man's salvation, because, in Sadoletto's view, Augustine's limited command of Greek had led him to mistaken interpretations.¹²¹ Sadoletto was convinced that he had achieved new insights into Paul's letter to the Romans.

Sadoletto saw himself as part of an international community of humanists, as he certainly was. Hence, he discussed the book on Romans with humanist friends and sent parts of it for comments and, of course, praise, to Erasmus and others. But both Cardinal Federico Fregoso and Erasmus warned him that conservatives would not like it.¹²² The worried Sadoletto in the spring of 1534 sent a copy of the completed manuscript to the Faculty of Theology of the University of Paris, which gave it to two readers to examine. However, the Faculty had not come to a decision when Sadoletto published his book in Lyon in early 1535. The Faculty of Theology eventually responded with disapproval sometime in 1535 and insisted that Sadoletto clarify some passages. But he had a more immediate and worse problem. Tommaso Badia (1483–1547), the Dominican Master of the Sacred Palace, the pope's official theologian who oversaw censorship in Rome, banned the work.¹²³ His objections were threefold: Sadoletto's lack of theological training, his failure to use the works of various scholastics, and omission of a discussion of

¹²⁰ "Hic ego, Librarium eum latino codice accersamus...." Sadoletto, *Opera*, 4, p. 10B.

¹²¹ "Sed Graecae linguae ignoratio qua imperfecta Augustinus utebatur, vim in eo maximi ingenii, tanquam virgultis & vepribus impeditam aliquoties detinuit." Letter of Sadoletto to Gian Matteo Giberti of 5 May 1532, Carpentras, in Sadoletto, *Opera*, 1, pp. 69AB.

¹²² Douglas, *Sadoletto*, pp. 86–87. See Sadoletto's letters to Erasmus of 9 June 1533 (Allen, Ep. 2816) and 9 December 1534 (Ep. 2982) and Erasmus' letters to Damien a Goes of 18 August 1535 (Ep. 3043, lines 54–59) and 15 December 1535 (Ep. 3076, lines 9–12). For more on the correspondence about the commentaries on Romans and humanists as a community of like-minded friends, see Ritter, *Sadoletto*, pp. 53–55, and Gesigora, *Sadoletto*, pp. 62, 157–58.

¹²³ Badia was as committed to church reform as Sadoletto and, along with Sadoletto, one of the seven authors of the *Consilium de emendanda ecclesia* of 1537. Although nothing is known about his training, he was probably a Thomist and definitely an Aristotelian. He is believed to have written several commentaries on Aristotle, but they have not survived. He was Master of the Sacred Palace from 1529 to 1542, when he was named cardinal. Giuseppe Alberigo, "Badia, Tommaso," in DBI 5, pp. 74–76.

prevenient grace (God's grace which enables man to do good works). This was an accusation of Pelagianism.¹²⁴

Sadoletto was not happy with the Faculty of Theology of the University of Paris and was furious at Badia. In a letter to a friend he acknowledged his ignorance in some areas, but maintained that his views were sound. He admitted that he lacked a doctorate in theology. But, he continued, if those who go to Paris can get a doctorate in theology after six years, surely his eight years of continuous theological study at Carpentras counted for something, especially because he had some wit and learning.¹²⁵ He confessed that he had not studied Durandus (Durand of St. Pourçain, c. 1275–1334, a nominalist), Capreolus (John Capreolus, 1380–1444, a French Dominican Thomist), and William of Ockham (c. 1285–1347), the greatest scholastic nominalist. But he had studied the Bible, St. Paul, Augustine, Ambrose, and Chrysostom, who were the pillars of true knowledge.¹²⁶ In other words, Sadoletto believed that his humanistic training and perspective, along with his native intelligence, were more than enough to enable him to discuss theological issues. Sadoletto had persuaded himself that because he was able to read scriptural texts in Greek, and because he knew the Fathers well, he was equipped to engage in biblical study and arrive at a correct theological understanding. He was angry that professional theologians criticized him for lacking a degree in theology, which he

¹²⁴ Ritter, *Sadoletto*, pp. 63–72; Douglas, *Sadoletto*, pp. 80–88.

¹²⁵ Sadoletto did not accurately describe the training of doctors of theology at Paris. According to the statutes of the Faculty of Theology of the University of Paris, the student early in his career was obliged to hear four years of lectures on the Bible and six years of lectures on the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard. Sadoletto may have referred to this part of the requirements. After those six years, the candidate had to lecture on the Bible and the *Sentences* for several years, engage in at least six disputations spread over several years, and survive examinations. In other words, the statutes mandated thirteen to fifteen years of study, lecturing, academic exercises, and residence. Farge, *Orthodoxy and Reform*, pp. 16–28. The statutes of Italian faculties of theology were modeled on those of Paris, but the requirements were often much shortened in practice. Grendler, *Universities*, pp. 360–63.

¹²⁶ “e l'avvedermi della mia ignoranza, mi farà buona dottrina, la quale ignoranza io non la disdico in me, sol dico, che, se quelli che vanno a Parigi a studiare in teologia, in sei anni si addottorano, io che l'ho studiata otto anni continui in Carpentras, non dovrei esser dalla natura sì mal dotato, che io non ne avessi preso qualche parte, e se ben non ho studiato Durandi, Capreolo, Ocham, ho studiato la Bibbia, San Paolo, Agostino, Ambrogio, Crisostomo, e quei degnissimi Dottori, che sono le colonne della vera scienza.” Sadoletto's letter to Giovanni Francesco Bini of 20 August 1535, in Sadoletto, *Opera*, 2, p. 222AB (entire letter pp. 221A–223A). Douglas, *Sadoletto*, p. 89, also translates a section of this letter.

thought unnecessary, and for ignoring the scholastics, whose writing he felt were barriers to true understanding. His reaction was typical of the response of humanists when attacked by professional theologians.¹²⁷

However, Sadoletto wanted the ban lifted. So, he settled down to gathering support in Rome and negotiating with Badia about changes.¹²⁸ In the end Sadoletto satisfied Badia by adding two pages of amplifications of his views on human merit in his discussion of Romans 8:29–31 and a few other minor changes, and the ban was lifted. A revised edition of Lyon 1536 included these changes. But editions of Venice, 1536, and Lyon, 1537, did not. His standing in Rome remained high; indeed, Paul III invited him to return to the Curia before the negotiations with Badia were finished. He worked hard for church reform and the council in his remaining years.¹²⁹ But he did not publish any more biblical or theological works.

3. THE ROLE OF THE PAPACY

All the above biblical humanists spent time in Rome, and all received some support from the papacy. Popes paid publication expenses, awarded printing privileges, accepted dedications, loaned manuscripts, offered moral support when humanists were criticized, and blocked the censures of the Faculty of Theology of the University of Paris. The most substantial aid, cardinals' hats and lucrative benefices, rewarded Cajetan and Sadoletto for other services, not their biblical studies. But high offices and large incomes enabled them to study and write when they were free of other duties. Whether substantial or limited, papal assistance was important to the individuals involved and to Italian biblical humanism.

The presence in Rome of Sadoletto and Cajetan, two major figures committed to biblical humanism, may have helped create a favorable climate for biblical humanism and persuaded the papacy to keep critics

¹²⁷ For some examples of arguments, including some colorful denunciations, between humanists and theologians over biblical humanism, especially in northern Europe, see Erika Rummel, *The Humanist-Scholastic Debate in the Renaissance and Reformation* (Cambridge, MA, 1995), pp. 96–125, 230–34.

¹²⁸ Ritter, *Sadoletto*, pp. 69–72; Douglas, *Sadoletto*, pp. 88–93.

¹²⁹ Douglas, *Sadoletto*, pp. 88–93, and chs. 6, 7, 9, and 11, for the rest of his career in Rome. Nothing more was heard from the Faculty of Theology of the University of Paris. See Farge, ed., *Registre des conclusions*, vol. 2.

at bay for some time. At the minimum, they helped protect Erasmus, the most prominent biblical humanist. Sadoletto was probably the strongest and most consistent supporter of Erasmus at the papal court. He wrote the letters of support for Erasmus that went out under the name of Leo X. And he defended him at the papal court in 1520 when Stunica (Diego López Zúñiga, d. 1531) began to attack Erasmus' edition of the New Testament in a series of polemical tracts. This was important, because Stunica lived in Rome in 1520 and 1521.¹³⁰

Cajetan viewed favorably Erasmus and his scholarship, or at least part of it, and defended him at the papal court. The relationship between Erasmus and Cajetan was distant and cool at first, but became closer and warmer over the years. Erasmus initially condemned Cajetan for his hostility to Luther at the diet of Augsburg in 1518. But he changed his mind in 1521 and thereafter praised the balance and objectivity he found in the cardinal's works. Finally in the years from 1531 to 1534 the two exchanged books and possibly as many as six letters, although only one has survived.¹³¹ In a letter of 23 July 1532, Erasmus explained to Cajetan that he had tried moderation when dealing with his critics, as Cajetan had advised, but that it did not work with people such as Noël Beda. He argued eloquently that he was completely orthodox in his views, and that he worked for peace in the church. He was content to try to satisfy Christ and men of good will. Erasmus concluded by saying that he did not care about dignities or benefices, but hoped that the pope would approve his actions and would give some testimony of this in a Rome full of libelous scandalmongers.¹³² Months later Erasmus reported that Cajetan had showed the letter to Clement, who read it attentively. Erasmus believed that it had strengthened his position with the pope and was grateful.¹³³

¹³⁰ For a short summary and references to the letters in Erasmus' correspondence, see Douglas, "Sadoletto," p. 186; and William B. Jones and Thomas B. Deutscher, "Diego López Zúñiga," in CEBR 2, pp. 348–49. See CWE, Ep. 1213: 27–41; Ep. 1302: 68–71, and Allen, Ep. 2385: 69–72. See also the essay by Alejandro Coroleu above, pp. 73–92.

¹³¹ In addition to Erasmus' letters, cited in the next three notes, see A. F. von Gunten, "Cajetan dans la correspondance d'Erasmus," in Bruno Pinchard and Saverio Ricci, eds., *Rationalisme analogique et humanisme théologique: La culture de Thomas de Vio 'Il Gaetano'* (Naples, 1993), p. 299 (whole article, pp. 297–323). For a briefer review, see Aguzzi-Barbagli, "Tommaso de Vio," pp. 239–42.

¹³² Allen, Ep. 2690, and especially the headnote in vol. 10, p. 66.

¹³³ Allen, Ep. 2779: 7–17.

Cajetan continued to defend Erasmus in Rome. On 16 May 1534 Jean Daniello wrote a short note to Erasmus that apparently accompanied a letter from Cajetan to Erasmus that has been lost. Daniello told Erasmus that some people in Rome had criticized a work of Erasmus, probably *De sarcienda ecclesiae concordia* (On Mending the Peace of the Church, 1533), a heartfelt appeal for church unity and plea for compromise with the Lutherans written as a commentary on Psalm 83. But, according to Daniello, Cajetan had in strong terms reduced to nothing the objections to Erasmus' work. Daniello added that he was now certain that his critics would be more just. And he offered to send Erasmus a copy of a recent work of Cajetan.¹³⁴ Thus, although Daniello did not mention the occasion or who was present, he indicated that Cajetan publicly defended Erasmus.

Cajetan's support of Erasmus and *De sarcienda ecclesiae concordia* is not surprising, because Cajetan was also willing to go quite far in order to reunite Lutherans and Catholics. In the summer of 1530 an imperial diet met at Augsburg, at which time the Protestant states presented the Augsburg Confession drafted by Philip Melancthon. This led to negotiations on both political and religious fronts, and a papal search for ways to bring the Lutherans back into the fold. Clement VII asked Cajetan for advice and received three position papers. While Cajetan firmly supported Catholic teaching on the Mass, basing his argument almost exclusively on the New Testament, he was remarkably flexible on Catholic discipline, law, and traditions, and favored leniency toward the Lutherans. Cajetan advised the pope that if the Lutherans returned to the Church, they should be permitted to have a married clergy on the model of the Greek church. They might be permitted communion under both species. Lutherans who returned should not be required to retract previous heretical statements but only to promise to refrain from repeating them. Lutheran princes should not be required to make professions of faith but simply to indicate their adherence without a formal ceremony. Most important, Cajetan advised the pope that the papacy should declare that laws and practices deemed to be of ecclesiastical, rather than divine, origin, were not binding under pain of mortal sin. Clement seemed willing to accept some of Cajetan's recommenda-

¹³⁴ "Antequam vidissem prenomiatum libellum vestrum quidam hic reprehendebant eum, dicentes Erasmus in totum permittere unicuique in suo sensu abundare, quam obiectionem postea me presente cardinalis optime diluit; certo scio nunc eos futuros equiores etc." Allen, Ep. 2935: 15–19.

tions as a basis for negotiations with the Lutherans. But the Curia was opposed and in the end the papacy did not use any of them.¹³⁵

The combination of a benign attitude toward Erasmus and favorable papal responses to individual requests for help certainly aided Italian biblical humanism. However, the papacy did not offer ongoing institutional or programmatic support for biblical humanism. It has been argued that the papacy supported biblical humanism by appointing professors of Greek and Hebrew to the University of Rome.¹³⁶ It is true that the Studium Urbis had professors of Greek now and then in the 1480s, and someone who probably taught Latin, Greek, and Hebrew in 1482.¹³⁷ In 1514, the year of the first surviving faculty roll, the Studium Urbis had three professors of Greek, but no professor of Hebrew. It may have had one or two professors of Greek in succeeding years. But none of the known professors of Greek of the 1480s and 1514 had any connection with biblical humanism.¹³⁸ And only Agazio Guidacerio is known to have taught Hebrew at the Studium Urbis during the pontificates of Leo X, Adrian VI, and Clement VII.

Leo X's short-lived Greek college did not help either. Almost immediately after election in 1513 he began to bring ten or twelve intelligent young Greeks of good families to Rome in order to study in a school alongside some young western Europeans. Leo hoped that the Greeks would teach Greek to the Europeans, while the Greeks would learn Latin, and that all would learn good letters. He then called two distinguished Greek scholars, Janus Lascaris (1445–1534), who came in 1513, and Marco Musuro (c. 1470–1517), who came in 1516, to teach Greek, plus another scholar to teach Latin. Leo provided a house

¹³⁵ For comment, translation, and notes on this work, see Wicks, *Cajetan Responds*, pp. 40–41, 201–03, 264–65, 287–89.

¹³⁶ O'Connor, "Neglected Facet," pp. 85, 87.

¹³⁷ See David S. Chambers, "Studium Urbis and *gabella studi*: The University of Rome in the Fifteenth Century," in Cecil H. Clough, ed., *Cultural Aspects of the Italian Renaissance: Essays in Honour of Paul Oskar Kristeller* (Manchester, 1976), pp. 89–91, 94 (whole article pp. 68–110); and especially Maria Cristina Dorati da Ripoli, "I lettori dello Studio e i maestri di grammatica a Roma da Sisto IV ad Alessandro VI," *Rassegna degli Archivi di Stato* 40 (1980), 107, 125–26 (whole article pp. 98–147). Incidentally, the University of Rome did not acquire the common name "La Sapienza" until the 1560s. It eventually became the official name of the university.

¹³⁸ For the 1514 roll, see *I maestri della Sapienza*, 1, pp. 1–5. The university had eighty-eight professors at this time, the high water mark for the sixteenth century. It drastically declined later in Leo's pontificate because of the shortage of funds. The next extant roll (1535) had only eighteen professors, one of them teaching Greek. *I maestri della Sapienza*, 1, pp. 6–7.

on the Quirinal Hill for the college and established a Greek printing press there. The college functioned in 1516 and 1517, but then faded, as Musuro died in 1517, and Lascaris went on a diplomatic mission to France in 1518. Nothing more was heard of the Greek college after 1519, the date of the last work to come from the Greek press. The names of a handful of the students are known, but neither they nor the teachers had any known connection with biblical studies.¹³⁹ Teachers and students probably concentrated on the pagan classics.

Clement VII may have considered sponsoring a program of biblical translation. In a letter to Clement of 1 January 1526, Pagnini referred vaguely to the pope bringing together experts in Hebrew and Greek to produce a new translation of sacred scripture.¹⁴⁰ The Dutch biblical scholar and expert in Hebrew, Jan van Campen (1491–1538) was more precise in 1532. He had heard that Clement wished to establish a Roman commission of six Jews and six Christians expert in Hebrew to produce a new translation of the Old Testament that would be faithful to the original Hebrew.¹⁴¹ Possible supporting evidence came from Agostino Steuco, who also wrote in 1532 that the pope had agreed with Jews who argued that corruptions in the Latin translation of the Old Testament had led to errors in interpretation.¹⁴² But if anything came of Clement's idea, or if it was anything more than a wish, it has escaped notice.¹⁴³

¹³⁹ The most important study is Vittorio Fanelli, "Il ginnasio greco di Leone X a Roma," *Studi romani* 9 (1961), 379–93. See also Pastor, *The History of the Popes*, 8, pp. 259–62; Anthony Grafton, "Janus Lascaris," in CEBR 2, pp. 292–94; Thomas B. Deutscher, "Marcus Musurus," CEBR 2, pp. 472–73; and Renazzi, *Storia dell'Università di Roma*, 2, pp. 12–13.

¹⁴⁰ "ut esset in Christianorum academiis qui hebreas, qui graecas publice profiterentur literas sanxit, tu iam coactis viris aliquot peritis, novam piissime translationem, condis sacrarum literarum..." From his *Utriusque Instrumenti nova translatio* (Lyon, 1528), sig. d iii recto, quoted by Gunten, "La contribution des 'Hébreux,'" p. 61, note 34.

¹⁴¹ "quemadmodum audio hunc nostrum summum Pontificem Clementem VII ante nuperrimam Romanae urbis expugnationem tentasse, ut videlicet ea provincia sex Iudaeis et sex Christianis Hebraice peritis mandaretur." Introductory epistle to his *Psalmorum omnium juxta hebraicam veritatem paraphrastica* (Lyon, 1532), quoted from a secondary source by Gunten, "La contribution des 'Hébreux,'" p. 61, note 34. For brief biographies of Campen see Peter Bietenholz, "Jan van Campen," in CEBR 1, pp. 255–56; and Gesigora, *Sadoletto*, pp. 191–94, 467–70.

¹⁴² Gunten, "La contribution des 'Hébreux,'" pp. 60–61, including a quote from Steuco in note 34.

¹⁴³ Gunten, "La contribution des 'Hébreux,'" p. 62, wonders if Cajetan embarked on his biblical studies as a result of the encouragement of Clement VII, and if Cajetan's mammoth effort was the realization of Clement's project. However, as O'Connor,

The papacy had many problems in these years. The Sack of Rome, the wars fought on Italian soil, foreign armies who marched up and down the peninsula, and the frantic diplomacy designed to avoid further disasters pre-occupied the papacy. War and politics drained the treasury and made it difficult for popes to give biblical humanism much attention. These same dire events disrupted the lives of Italian biblical humanists and sent some of them abroad.

4. CONCLUSION

All the Italian biblical humanists discussed above shared a desire to study and reveal God's word as found in the Bible. All realized that the Vulgate was not perfect and rejected scholastic commentary. With the exception of Felice da Prato and Cajetan, they made considerable use of the Church Fathers. And several of them endured attacks from conservative theologians. But there were also differences among them.

Fra Felice da Prato, Giustiniani, Pagnini, and Guidacerio were Christian Hebrew scholars whose primary concern was to get the text right in order to elucidate the books of the Bible in their literal and historical meaning. To do that they had to learn Hebrew, and sometimes other ancient biblical languages, and study Jewish biblical scholarship and the Fathers, and they did so. Cajetan used assistants in order to enter the world of the Hebrew Old Testament. This suggests that there was a good deal of scholarly interchange between Jewish scholars and Christian biblical humanists in Italy. The hostility toward Jewish learning that the Reuchlin affair uncovered in northern Europe does not seem to have been present in Italy at this time.¹⁴⁴ Italian Christian scholars took full advantage of the open climate.

The Italian biblical humanists did not join the theological battles of the day except inadvertently, when one of their translations or comments caught the attention of conservative theologians. They were individual scholars who often lived and studied far from important courts. Even Cajetan and his assistants labored in Gaeta, not in Rome, while Sadoletto studied and wrote in Carpentras. Most of the Italian

"Neglected Facet," pp. 80–82, 90–93, has demonstrated, the Bible had always been important to Cajetan.

¹⁴⁴ See the perceptive study of Erika Rummel, "Humanists, Jews, and Judaism," in Dean Phillip Bell and Stephen G. Burnett, eds., *Jews, Judaism, and the Reformation in Sixteenth-Century Germany* (Leiden, 2006), pp. 3–31.

biblical humanists had limited contact with the prestigious circle of international humanism, the world of Erasmus.

Sadoletto was different. He was Erasmus' friend and lived in the world of high churchmen. He was a Greek and Latin humanist who brought rhetorical skills to biblical exegesis. While he often corrected Jerome's Vulgate, he was more a moralist and theologian than a philologist. And he grappled with a large theological issue

The Italian biblical humanists devoted a great deal of energy to the Psalms, because they were essential to the corporate prayer of the Church.¹⁴⁵ The Psalms had a large presence in the liturgy of Catholicism, in the changing and unchanging prayers of the Mass, and the required prayers that members of religious orders read and chanted. Hence, it is quite understandable that religious order biblical humanists (Fra Felice da Prato, Giustiniani, Pagnini, and Cajetan) would study the Psalms. Moreover, Christian exegetical tradition emphasized a messianic and Christological interpretation of the Psalms.

The most striking and original feature of the Italian biblical humanists was their concentration on the Hebrew Old Testament and Jewish scholarship. The greatest contribution of the Italian biblical humanists was to introduce ancient and medieval Hebrew biblical scholarship into mainstream Catholic, and sometimes Protestant, biblical scholarship.

¹⁴⁵ Cristoforo Marcello (d. 1527), Venetian patrician, humanist, and archbishop of Corfu, who was tortured and murdered in the Sack of Rome, also wrote commentaries on individual Psalms and some Epistles. But they remain in manuscript in Italian libraries and await study. For some of the manuscripts of his Psalm commentaries, see Paul Oskar Kristeller, *Iter Italicum: A Finding List of Uncatalogued or Incompletely Catalogued Humanistic Manuscripts of the Renaissance in Italian and Other Libraries*, 2 (London and Leiden, 1967), pp. 285A, 365A. For a brief summary of Marcello's life and further bibliography, see Nelson H. Minnich, "Concepts of Reform Proposed at the Fifth Lateran Council," *Archivum Historiae Pontificiae* 7 (1969), 181–83, 229, 231–34 (complete article, pp. 163–251). This is reprinted with new appendices as Study IV in Nelson Minnich, *The Fifth Lateran Council (1512–17): Studies on its Membership, Diplomacy and Proposals of Reform* (Aldershot, 1993).

ALBERTO PIO'S DEFENSE OF SCHOLASTIC THEOLOGY

Nelson H. Minnich

One of the most skillful defenses of scholastic theology against the biting criticisms of Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam (c. 1467–1536) was undertaken by someone who lacked university training in theology and whose fame at the time rested on his status as a prince of the Holy Roman Empire, distinguished diplomat, and noted patron of humanists and artists. This champion was Alberto III Pio de Savoia (1475–1531), prince of the county of Carpi (near Modena in northern Italy), who was offended by many statements he read in Erasmus' writings and who was drawn into a literary exchange with him due to the Dutchman's claims that Pio had misrepresented his views. Among the topics of contention was Erasmus' disparagement of scholastic theologians and their method, as well as his call to replace their style of theology with one based on the Bible and church fathers. While praising the biblical humanism of Erasmus for its ability to inspire piety, Pio claimed that it was a rude form of theology that needed to be supplemented by the divinely-inspired scholastic method that allowed one to clarify doctrine, resolve doubt, and refute error. Most scholastic theologians were deserving of praise and not of condemnation. Pio made his arguments in two published works, in the *Responsio accurata et paraenetica* (1529), written as an answer to a letter from Erasmus, and in the *Tres et viginti libri in locos lucubrationum variarum* (1531) published posthumously.¹

¹ Among the works that survey this debate, see Myron P. Gilmore, "Erasmus and Alberto Pio, Prince of Carpi," in Theodore K. Rabb and Jerrold E. Seigel, eds., *Action and Conviction in Early Modern Europe: Essays in Memory of E.H. Harbison* (Princeton, 1969), pp. 299–318; Erika Rummel, *Erasmus and His Catholic Critics*, 2 (Nieuwkoop, 1989), pp. 115–26; and Nelson H. Minnich, "Introduction," in CWE 84, pp. xv–cxli. The full titles of Pio's two works are: *Alberti Pii Carporum Comitississimi ad Erasmi Roterdami expostulationem responsio accurata et paraenetica*, Martini Lutheri et asseclorum eius haeresim vesanam magnis argumentis et justis rationibus confutans (Paris, 1529)—hereafter cited as *Responsio paraenetica*—and *Alberti Pii Carporum Comitississimi et viri longe doctissimi, praeter praefationem et operis conclusionem, tres et viginti libri in locos lucubrationum variarum D. Erasmi Roterdami, quos censet ab eo recognoscendos et retractandos* (Paris, 1531)—hereafter cited as *XXIII libri*. The author is grateful to Dr. Daniel J. Sheerin for having made available to him a draft of his translation of the two sections of the *XXIII libri* (fols. 76rI–79vN and 172vL–76vV) in which Pio treated directly the question of scholastic theology. He is also grateful

If most of Pio's time over the years was spent in administering his principedom and in the diplomatic service of Gianfrancesco Gonzaga of Mantua (1506–07), Louis XII of France (1507–11), Maximilian I of the Holy Roman Empire (1511–19), and Francis I of France (1523–27), he nonetheless found time for the study of classical letters, philosophy, and theology. His uncle Giovanni Pico della Mirandola (1463–94) had laid out for him a course of studies that included a solid grounding in the Latin and Greek languages and literature. Among his personal tutors were the distinguished humanists Aldo Manuzio (1449–1515), Triphon Bisanti (d. 1540), and Marcus Musurus (1470–1517).² A contemporary claimed that so assiduously did Pio dedicate himself to the study of letters both as a youth and in his later years that few in all of Italy could compare to him regarding eloquence of speech.³ Pio's skill in writing a Ciceronic style of Latin was even praised by Erasmus as being superior to that of the noted humanist Girolamo Aleandro (1480–1542).⁴

Pio also mastered Aristotelian philosophy under the tutelage of Pietro Pomponazzi (1462–1525), Juan de Montesdoca, and Andrea Barrus (perhaps the Augustinian Baura). He studied the scholastic theologies of Thomas Aquinas and John Duns Scotus under such distinguished theologians as the Franciscan Graziano da Brescia and the as yet unidentified hermit Valerio. So skillful did he become in the scholastic method that he would debate both publicly and privately some of the most difficult questions. But as time went on, he became more interested in Sacred Scripture and the writings of the church fathers, especially those of Augustine and Jerome. The young Spanish humanist and philosopher Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda (1490–1573), who resided in Pio's

to Drs. Paul F. Grendler and Erika Rummel for their helpful suggestions on how this chapter can be improved.

² Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda, *Antapologia pro Alberto Pio Comite Carpensi in Erasmus Roterodamum* (Rome, 1532), sigs. Ciiiv–Ciiir, now available in a modern critical edition as Julián Solana Pujalte, ed., *Antiapología en defensa de Alberto Pio, príncipe de Carpi, frente a Erasmo de Rotterdam*, in Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda, *Obras completas*, eds. Antonio Fernández Ramírez et al., VII (Salamanca, 2003), Introducción, pp. XIII–LXXXV; Bibliografía, pp. LXXXVI–CX; Conspectus siglorum, p. CXI; Latin text and Spanish translation, pp. 112–63; Laminas, p. 165; Aparato de Loci Similes, pp. 167–217; the relevant citation here is pp. 123–24.

³ Sepúlveda, *Antapologia*, sigs. Ciiiv–ivr, Eiiir and Solana, ed., *Antiapología*, pp. 126–27, 133.

⁴ Erasmus, *Ciceronianus*, in ASD I–2, p. 670, and in CWE 27, pp. 585–86 and notes 662–64.

Roman palace in the 1520s, asserted that Pio had become so familiar with both the Old and New Testaments that no one in his household knew the scriptures better than he.⁵ Pio's interest in the scholarly study of the Bible was such that he collected versions of the New Testament in Syriac and Arabic and hired tutors to teach him these languages. He also showed interest in Ethiopian sacred scriptures. Some scholars have speculated that he intended to publish his own polyglot New Testament along the lines of Erasmus' *Novum Instrumentum* (1516), the *Psalterium octuplex* (1516) of bishop Agostino Giustiniani, OP (c. 1470–1536), and the Complutensian Polyglot (1514–17) of the Alcalá scholars sponsored by archbishop Francisco Jiménez de Cisneros, OFM (1436–1517).⁶ What time was left over from his duties as ambassador Pio dedicated to the study of letters, both sacred and secular.⁷

Pio was known in Roman circles as a patron of humanists. Poems were dedicated to him in the famous collection of the writings of the humanists of the Roman Academy gathered around Johann Goritz (c. 1455–1527) that was published in 1524 as the *Coryciana*. When the case of the German Hebraist Johann Reuchlin (c. 1455–1522) was referred to Rome for trial, Pio intervened on his behalf with Leo X.⁸ Like his uncle Giovanni Pico, Pio seems to have had been open-minded and interested in a wide variety of philosophical and theological studies. But as a pious member of and spokesman for the establishment, he also rejected ideas and criticisms he saw as threatening to the religious and social order. His contemporaries saw in Pio someone skilled both in humanistic studies and in theology, whether biblical, patristic, or scholastic, and as someone who would speak out against anyone whom

⁵ Among those known to have found hospitality in his household in Rome were, in addition to Sepúlveda, who was re-translating Aristotle's works for Clement VII, the young Italian humanist who served as his personal secretary, Francesco Florido from Sabina (1511–47), and the Maronite monk, Elias son of Abraham, who copied Syriac material for Pio's extensive library and praised him as "a lover of guests." According to the Roman census of 1526–27, Pio's household contained sixty-four persons, see Egmont Lee, ed., *Descriptio urbis: The Roman Census of 1527* (Rome, 1985), p. 67 (nr. 3295).

⁶ Celestino Cavedoni, "Notizia letteraria di alcuni codici orientali e greci della R. Biblioteca Estense che già furono di Alberto Pio Principe di Carpi," in *Memorie di Religione, di Morale e di Letteratura*, serie III, vol. 17 (Modena, 1843), pp. 1–19, esp. p. 12, and Giorgio Levi della Vida, *Ricerche sulla formazione del più antico fondo dei manoscritti orientali della Biblioteca Vaticana* (Vatican City, 1939), p. 108; for Pio's interest in the Ethiopian writings, see Pio, *XXIII libri*, fol. 96rG.

⁷ Sepúlveda, *Antapologia*, sigs. Ciiir–ivv, and Solana, ed., *Antiapologia*, pp. 125–27.

⁸ Biagio Pallai, ed., *Coryciana* (Rome, 1524), sigs. DDiiir, EEiv, EEiiir; Pio, *Responsio paraeneticum*, fol. 28vR. For Reuchlin, see above pp. 39–54.

he viewed as undermining church beliefs and practices. The prince of Carpi was the ideal person to answer the attacks on scholastic theology coming from the prince of humanists, Erasmus of Rotterdam.

It took many years for Pio to come to the conclusion that Erasmus threatened the Faith. He first saw him in Venice where Erasmus was working at the Aldine press on his *Adages* that would be published in September of 1508. Manuzio had nothing but praise for the Dutchman. Years later Pio read the *Adages*, which he admired for their display of learning. As time went on, he came to esteem Erasmus more and more for his remarkable eloquence and vast erudition, and to praise him before important persons as a German who has equaled or excelled in the Latin language those reared in Latium and in Greek those born in Greece.⁹ When Pio read Erasmus' *Praise of Folly* (1511), possibly an Italian edition dating from 1515 or later, according to Clarence H. Miller, his opinion of its author shifted.¹⁰ While he still admired his literary skills, Pio took offense at the indiscriminate criticisms Erasmus had made against church practices and officials. He also came to the conclusion that Erasmus' skills in philosophy and theology did not match his mastery of classical languages. His reading of Erasmus' *Novum Instrumentum* (1516) and *Paraphrases* (published from 1517 onward) only confirmed this judgment. Pio was not the only person in Rome to find fault with Erasmus' writings. The prominent humanist Battista Casali (c. 1473–1525) was coming to a more severe judgment: that Erasmus was not only a careless scholar, but also a pseudo-Christian and heretic.¹¹ Another critic was Pio's protégé and Erasmus' former friend from his days at the Aldine press, Girolamo Aleandro (1480–1524), who had become librarian of the Vatican Library and personal secretary of Giulio de' Medici, the vice-chancellor of the Church and later pope Clement VII. As the papal nuncio sent to the Diet of Worms (1521) to secure the implementation of the bull *Decet Romanum Pontificem* against Martin Luther, Aleandro discreetly blamed Erasmus' heterodox and venomous writings for providing the basis for the Lutheran revolt.¹²

⁹ Pio, *Responsio paraenetica*, fols. 2v–3r.

¹⁰ Clarence H. Miller, "Introduction," in ASD IV–3, pp. 27–28, notes 79, 81, and pp. 44–58, nrs. 7, 8, 13, 19, 32.

¹¹ John Monfasani, "Erasmus, the Roman Academy, and Ciceronianism: Battista Casali's Invective," *Erasmus of Rotterdam Society Yearbook* 17 (1997), 19–54, at 22, 29, 44–48 and 52, note 41.

¹² Peter Balan, *Monumenta Reformationis Lutheranae ex Tabulariis Secretoribus S. Sedis 1521–1525* (Regensburg, 1884), pp. 55, 80–81, 101–02. For the attitude toward biblical

The most vocal of Erasmus' critics in Rome was probably the Spanish scholar Diego López de Zúñiga (d. 1531) who was denouncing him both in learned gatherings and in a series of pamphlets printed in Rome. Having worked on the Complutensian Polyglot, López de Zúñiga claimed to find numerous scholarly errors in Erasmus' *Novum Instrumentum*; in his other writings López de Zúñiga found impieties and even blasphemies which he listed under various headings.¹³ Pio admitted to having read some of López de Zúñiga's attacks on Erasmus.¹⁴ That Pio was joining in the chorus of Erasmus' critics at the dinner parties of cardinals and at the gatherings of the learned in Rome was eventually reported back to the Dutchman.¹⁵

In an effort to check this stream of criticism, Erasmus wrote to Pio on 10 October 1525, rehearsing the reported denunciations and responding to them with denials and counter charges. Erasmus countered the attack on his scholarship for being shoddy, devoid of competent philosophical and theological analysis, and lacking in solid doctrine with the assertion that in those areas where he tackled a topic, he treated them with reasonable competence. He did not claim to be a great philosopher or theologian. When at the urgings of others he treated the issue of free will, he did so in as simple a manner as he could and did not show any disrespect for the Faith. He devoted himself to the study of Latin language and literature in order to support and not harm traditional learning. He denied that his writings were the source of the present troubles and provided inspiration for Luther. Erasmus noted the irony in Luther's similar assertion that Erasmus was no theologian. It was not Erasmus' intent that the German Reformer should derive any inspiration from his works. He never supported Luther, Erasmus affirmed, rather he actively discouraged others from joining him. Lutheran efforts to draw

humanism at the papal court in Rome, see Paul F. Grendler's essay in this volume, above pp. 227–76.

¹³ On Zúñiga, see Richard H. Graham, "Erasmus and Stunica: A Chapter in the History of New Testament Scholarship," *Erasmus of Rotterdam Society Yearbook* 10 (1990), 9–60; Henk Jan de Jonge, "Four Unpublished Letters on Erasmus from J.L. Stunica to Pope Leo X (1520)," in *Colloque Erasmi de Liège*, fasc. 247 (Paris, 1987), pp. 147–60, at 149 and 153; and Alejandro Coroleu's essay in this volume, above pp. 73–92.

¹⁴ Pio, *XXVIII libri*, fol. 69rF: "Iūdem feci in... aliquot ex censuris Stunicae: eoque Romae esset: et tuas illis responsiones."

¹⁵ Cf. Erasmus' letter to Pio in October 1525, Allen 6, Ep. 1479: 130–39 / CWE 11, Ep. 1479: 146–56; cf. also Allen 6, Ep. 1482: 21–22, 30, 46–47, 56–59 / CWE 11, Ep. 1482: 25–26, 35, 52–53, 63–67; Allen 6, Ep. 1576: 34–48 / CWE 11, Ep. 1576: 39–58; Allen 6, Ep. 1634: 39–42 / CWE 11, 1634: 44–47; etc.

Erasmus away from the Catholic Church had failed. So too had the attempts of Catholic theologians to push Erasmus into openly joining the Lutheran movement. The true causes of the disturbances were not the writings of Erasmus, but the arrogance of these theologians, the godless lives of some clerics, and the tyranny of certain monks. Pio should desist from his unjust and dangerous criticisms of Erasmus.¹⁶

Due to the burden of his diplomatic duties, to being incapacitated at times by a debilitating illness, and to his concern that his answer to Erasmus' letter be written in an elegant Ciceronic style, Pio took almost seven months to pen a reply. Helping him in its composition by critiquing his drafts was Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda, the scholar resident in his household who was composing his own refutation of Luther's teachings on free will.¹⁷ Pio's youthful secretary Florido provided only the technical assistance expected from an amanuensis.¹⁸ Pio began his reply with a refutation of the charges made by Erasmus. He wrote that he had always esteemed his literary abilities and felt that if Erasmus devoted the effort required he could also become an expert philosopher and theologian. If Erasmus never intended to stir up a tumult, his writings nonetheless provided support to those who attack the Church. His positions were so similar to Luther's that either Luther erasmicized or Erasmus lutherized. In Pio's view, Erasmus called into doubt church teachings and practice. By his failure early on to oppose Luther, Erasmus seemed to be supporting him. Unlike the ancient church fathers he so admired, Erasmus has failed to use his great influence among Germans and skill as a writer to confront openly the heretical teachings of Luther and his followers. Pio then showed Erasmus how to refute Luther's claims to having received a divine mission to reform the Church and interpret Scripture in a way contrary to the Church's teachings.

¹⁶ Letter of Erasmus to Alberto Pio, Basel, 10 October 1525, Allen 6, Ep. 1634: 1–111 / CWE 11, Ep. 1634: 1–126.

¹⁷ Sepúlveda's *De fato et libero arbitrio dogma Lutheri confutatur* was published in Rome on the press of Antonio Blado in June of 1526. In his *Antapologia*, he described his role as that of a critic of Pio's drafts—see sig. Divr-v, and Solana, ed., *Antiapologia*, pp. 131–32.

¹⁸ Sepúlveda, *Antapologia*, sig. Diiiiv, and Solana, ed., *Antiapologia*, pp. 130–31. For Florido see above, note 5. In his *Apologia in M. Plauti...calumniatores* (Basel, 1540), Florido explained that he fulfilled his duties as well as he could, being an adolescent (p. 116). He also refuted Erasmus' claims that the Paris theologians had supplied Pio's arguments (p. 264). By 1540 Florido had established a name for himself as a philologist and protagonist in the contemporary Ciceronian debate.

Pio criticized as too gentle, confusing, and lacking in doctrinal clarity Erasmus' *De libero arbitrio diatribe sive collatio* (1524).

He rejected Erasmus' claim that the immorality of some clerics and the tyranny of certain monks were partly responsible for the tumult. Instead of answering the charge, Pio mounted a defense of monasticism and the priesthood, claiming that Erasmus' criticisms of monks were motivated by his own failure as a monk and defection from his order. Those who cannot attain the monastic ideal try to justify their own failure by attacking it as an insane way of life, Pio noted. Criticisms of priests often came from those who were jealous of their powers and wealth. For their service to the faithful, secular clergy were entitled to a recompense that helped to maintain a decorum befitting the priestly dignity. They administered the wealth of the Church in the service of its various missions.¹⁹

Pio provided a detailed defense of theologians. Hostility between German humanists and scholastic theologians was not so significant a factor in the outbreak of the tumult as claimed by Erasmus. While some humanists who defended Reuchlin against the attacks of theologians also tended to support Luther in order to be consistent in their opposition to various representatives of the Church, this need not have been the case. By failing to adopt the seriousness and good judgment of Italians at the same time that they learned from them humanistic skills, German humanists became arrogant and attacked theologians for failing to use philology when studying Sacred Scripture. The new humanistic style of theology that they developed was capable of stirring up piety among the laity, but it could not resolve difficult questions regarding the proper interpretation of obscure scriptural passages. For such tasks the divinely-invented scholastic method was needed. Theologians guilty of incompetence, pride, and immorality were worthy of censure, but the others were to be praised. The reason for the outbreak of the Reformation lay not with the scholastic theologians but with the German humanists who were jealous of the power and wealth of the papacy, who opposed reasonable Roman taxes, and who wished to abolish church regulations in the name of Christian liberty.²⁰ Pio concluded by exhorting Erasmus to continue refuting Luther in

¹⁹ Pio, *Responsio paraenetica*, fols. 2rA–28vR, 37vD–66rQ; Minnich, "Introduction," pp. xlviii–lvi.

²⁰ Pio, *Responsio paraenetica*, fols. 28vS–37rC, 66vR–71rR.

his writings. He assured Erasmus that he admired him for his virtues and learning and hoped that his epistle would help to forge bonds of friendship with him.²¹

Soon after receiving Pio's letter, Erasmus began working on a reply. The Sack of Rome (May 1527), however, led to Pio's leaving Rome and Erasmus was unsure as to where to send his rejoinder. Eventually Pio settled in Paris where he was supported by king Francis I. Erasmus responded to Pio's offer of friendship by complimenting his Ciceronian Latin style in passing in his dialogue *Ciceronianus* (March 1528). On being alerted by the laudatory passage in the dialogue that there existed a literary work by Pio, scholars pressured the prince to publish it. Reluctantly he revised for publication the only copy he had of his letter to Erasmus, the rough draft that had survived the Sack, and on 5 January 1529 it was printed on the press of Josse Bade in Paris.²²

Erasmus was unhappy with its publication. On learning of its impending appearance, he wrote to Pio to request either its suppression or the softening of its criticisms. Unfortunately, his letter was deliberately not delivered to Pio for fear it might provoke a hostile response. Upon receiving in early February a copy of Pio's *Responsio paraenetica*, Erasmus revised the draft of his earlier reply and rushed it through the press of Froben in Basel with the publication date of March 1529 so as to have it ready for sale at the spring Frankfurt Book Fair.²³

In his *Responsio*, Erasmus attacked the character and abilities of Pio. He claimed that the Italian prince was a gullible and deceitful spokesman for a pagan sodality of Roman critics whom he described as jealous Italian humanists excessively devoted to Ciceronian style, pseudo-monks, and irresponsible theologians. They supplied Pio with recycled unfair accusations, weak arguments, and careless editorial services. The charges, Erasmus said, had already been answered elsewhere. He denied backing Luther. In fact, he had written against him and remained a loyal son of the Church, supportive of its defined teachings, offices, and institutions. He has criticized only abuses, excesses, and superstitions. Pio should join him in writing against Luther.²⁴

²¹ Pio, *Responsio paraenetica*, fols. 98vN–99vN.

²² Pio, *Responsio paraenetica*, sig. Aiir–Aivv; Pio, *XXIII libri*, fols. 70r–vI–K; Allen 6–7, Epp. 1744: 130; 1804: 249–53; 2066: 60–65; Minnich, “Introduction,” pp. lvii–lviii.

²³ Allen 7, Ep. 2080: 1–2, 24–25; *Responsio*, LB IX, col. 1096C–97B; *Apologia*, LB IX, col. 1134D / CWE 84, p. 153; Minnich, “Introduction,” pp. lxiii–lxvii.

²⁴ Erasmus, *Responsio*, LB IX, cols. 1098A–B, 1102B, 1107D, 1110B, 1111B, 1112C 1121E–22B / CWE 84, pp. 10–11, 29, 51, 59, 63, 66, 101–02; Pio summarized Erasmus' criticisms in his *XXIII libri*, fol. 67vC; Minnich, “Introduction,” pp. lxviii–lxxiii.

Upon receiving a copy of Erasmus' *Responsio*, Pio feared that a failure to respond could be taken as an admission of the validity of Erasmus' counter-charges. Despite his worsening health, Pio therefore took up the difficult task of composing a rejoinder. He began by inserting marginal notes attached to comments he found objectionable. But these could be seen as nit-picking and were too constricted in length. He then subjected to detailed analysis and criticism what he considered one of Erasmus' most offensive works, the *Moriae encomium* (*Praise of Folly*). Realizing that he could not devote as much attention to each of Erasmus' works as he had given to the *Moriae encomium* (it took up eleven folio pages, recto and verso, and became book 3 of his *XXIII libri*), Pio thereafter adopted a topical approach, devoting to each subject a separate book. He excerpted and submitted to criticism comments drawn from Erasmus' writings. The works that caught most of Pio's attention were the *Annotationes in Novum Instrumentum*, Erasmus' life of St. Jerome and scholia on his letters, the *Colloquia*, the *Ratio seu methodus compendio perveniendi ad veram theologiam*, *Enchiridion militis christiani* with its preface to Abbot Volz, and the *Supputatio calumniarum Natalis Bedae*. Pio organized the comments taken from these writings under such headings as: fasting (book 4), monasticism (5), ceremonies (6), church decoration (7), veneration of sacred images (8), the cult of the saints (9), the neologisms of the theologians and scholastic theology (10), Sacred Scripture and its authors (11), the mystery of the Trinity (12), the authority of priests and bishops (13), the primacy of Peter and power of the pope (14), church regulations (15), vows of continence (16), virginity and celibacy (17), matrimony (18), confession (19), faith and good works (20), warfare and its legality (21), swearing (22), lying (23), and the conclusion and end of the disputation (24). Pio died on 8 January 1531, while revising this work for publication. With the assistance of Josse Bade and Francesco Florido, the work was put into proper form and published on Bade's press on 9 March 1531. His comments on theology are to be found primarily in books three and ten.²⁵

Pio provided a carefully reasoned defense of scholastic theology. He defined theology as a "knowledge, with an element of reasoning, especially of things divine and also of certain other things that are not apparent to us, but have been divinely revealed." Theology depends

²⁵ Pio, *XXIII libri*, sig. āiir, fols. 69vI–70vK, 71vN–72rO, 73vC, 73rA–84rF (book 3); Minnich, "Introduction," pp. lxxiv–lxxx, lxxxiv–lxxxviii.

on revelation and cannot be derived only from one's own reasoning.²⁶ Given the element of reasoning in theology, theology needs to be mixed with philosophy.

Pio defined philosophy as "the evident or probable knowledge both of things divine and of things natural and human obtained by reason, partly through the power of the mind from its inborn light, and partly through the senses."²⁷ Because the intellect or mind touches all things in one way or another, philosophy is involved in all things. It is the common property of humanity. Depending on their mental capacities and industry, humans seek knowledge of things and of their causes based on nature. But not all things are immediately clear. To prove a truth one must have recourse to what is self-evident and engage in extended reasoning or appeal to an authority. The philosopher whose authority is unchallenged by all nations, be they Greek, Latin, or barbarian, is Aristotle, "the greatest of all philosophers and nearly divine... a miracle of nature." A position based on his authority is considered reliable by all the most learned men. Contrary to Erasmus' accusation that he was a blasphemous philosopher, Aristotle stuck to natural knowledge and even held that there was a creator. Erasmus' accusation provided self-incriminating proof that he was not well trained in Aristotle's teachings. The proverb proved true: each man disdains those studies in which he has not been well trained or has been unsuccessful. Aristotle's philosophy is deservedly admired for being concise yet comprehensive, using proper terminology and clear organization. It can be easily adapted to theology. Plato's philosophy, on the other hand, uses metaphors and allegories, and contains much to be detested such as his teaching on a community of goods and wives, something contrary to the law of Christ.²⁸

Theology and philosophy cannot act in opposition because both come from God, theology providing a knowledge immediately revealed by God, philosophy a knowledge derived through the intermediary of

²⁶ Pio, *XXIII libri*, fol. 173vM: "Dicamusque theologiam notitiam esse cum aliquali ratione rerum in primis divinarum caeterarumque nobis non evidentium sed divinitus revelatarum...."

²⁷ Ibid., fol. 173vM: "philosophiam evidentem esse aut probabilem notitiam rerum cum divinarum tum naturalium ac humanarum ratione partim vi mentis suo innato lumine, partim ex sensibus conquistam."

²⁸ Pio, *XXIII libri*, fols. 79rN, 174vO: "At maximus ac prope divinus Aristoteles... Fuit quippe Aristoteles omnium iudicio quoddam singulare naturae miraculum;" 250vV (Plato).

nature. Truths derived from nature are more evident but not as sure as those that are revealed. Indeed, knowledge based on nature is frail and subordinate to revelation, but it can also aid theology by functioning as its servant and attendant.²⁹

Theology needs the assistance of philosophy. Revelation is not always clear, but at times obscure and convoluted, needing human effort to render it explicit, to resolve the seeming contradictions and absurdities found in the Bible. While the Holy Spirit can infuse knowledge so that someone who once was uneducated becomes the wisest of men, as happened with the Apostles, such an occurrence is miraculous and rare. Human reasoning is needed to comprehend revelation more completely and clearly, to defend and explain it upon demand. Without philosophy, theology cannot be studied correctly and precisely. This is demonstrated by the example of such church fathers as Augustine, Ambrose, Jerome, Hilary, Origen, Gregory Nazienzen, and John Chrysostom. Mixing philosophy with theology is not only not unsuitable, but rather opportune and necessary.³⁰

Pio defended the scholastic method that Erasmus had denounced as very different from that used by the church fathers and as making everything too complex.³¹ Pio rejected Erasmus' assertion that patristic theology had fallen into disuse due to the neglect of bishops and theologians. Blame for its decline lay with the wars and depredations of the barbarians. The way of doing theology that replaced it and was associated with commentating on the *Sentences* [of Peter Lombard], unfortunately, employed a Latin that was less idiomatic and polished. Nevertheless, it provided for a complete and precise treatment of difficult topics and for a brief and unambiguous defense of Christian doctrine against heretics and unbelievers.³²

Pio began his defense by describing the scholastic method. It proposes a topic for discussion in the form of a question and then presents the

²⁹ Pio, *XXIII libri*, fols. 173v–74rM.

³⁰ Pio, *XXIII libri*, fol. 174rM–N.

³¹ Among the quotations from Erasmus' writings cited by Pio was one taken from Desiderius Erasmus et al., eds., *Omnia opera Divi Eusebii Hieronymi Stridonensis*, 2 (Basel, 1516), fol. 2r / CWE 61, p. 68: "The subject matter now treated far and wide in the schools is so tightly packed with Aristotelian dogmatism and sophistical nonsense (not to say contaminated by vain fancies) and so enveloped in the labyrinths of vain and trivial questions that Jerome himself, should he return to life, or even Paul, would be considered utterly ignorant of theology in that milieu."

³² Pio, *XXIII libri*, fol. 176vT.

arguments and doubts for and against a particular answer. It clarifies the issues by eliminating all circumlocutions and rhetorical colorings. It then defines and expounds on the matter briefly and exactly. By presenting probable arguments based on reasoning and on the common principles about which all agree, the scholastic method can answer the attacks of non-believers who reject the authority of Sacred Scripture, comparing it to dreams and hallucination. By giving a rational account of the Faith, it defends and proves church teachings and refutes what opposes them. It provides a developed and quick way for finding precise truths, eliminating doubts, and explaining matter concisely. According to Pio, it is a method divinely inspired.³³

Pio addressed Erasmus' complaint that scholastic theologians often engage in pointless questions that are divorced from and an obstacle to authentic devotion.³⁴ At the beginnings of the Church, the power of God's word and the grace of the Holy Spirit led people to recognize and accept the truthfulness of the Christian message without doubts and disputes. The writers of the New Testament directly addressed some doctrinal issues: for example, John the divinity of Jesus, Paul predestination and free will, and James faith and good works. But when pagan philosophers and heretics attacked the Faith, the church fathers had to come to its defense, answering questions and refuting errors. They did so according to the accepted practices of their time, in an elegant way, by imitating the style of Plato. Today's theologians followed the style of Aristotle, achieving greater precision by using dialectics and technical language. Their decision to follow Aristotle rather than another philosopher was very prudent. They did not dispute over the principal

³³ Pio, *XXIII libri*, fols. 174v–75vP.

³⁴ Among the quotations from Erasmus' writings cited by Pio is an annotation on 1 Tim. 1:6: "Accordingly, we too must be very careful not to pursue theology in such a way that we lapse into *mathologia* [vain talk]. For what good is it to know how many ways sin can be understood, whether it is a privation or a stain sticking to the soul..." LB VI, col. 926D; Anne Reeve, ed., *Annotations on the New Testament: Galatians to the Apocalypse. Facsimile of the Final Latin Text with All Earlier Variants* (Leiden, 1993), p. 662. In the *Moriae encomium*, Erasmus has Folly provide a sample of the theologians' pointless questions: "What was the exact moment of divine generation? Are there several filiations in Christ? Is it a possible proposition that God the Father could hate his Son? Could God have taken on the form of a woman, a devil, a donkey, a gourd, or a flintstone? If so, how could a gourd have preached a sermon, performed miracles, and been nailed to the cross? ... There are any amount of quibbles even more refined than these about concepts, relations, instants, formalities, quiddities, and eccities..." *Moriae encomium, id est, Stultitiae laus*, in LB IV, col. 465A-B; ASD IV-3, pp. 146-48: lines 400-04, 408-09; CWE 27, p. 127.

dogmas, but spend much of their time on important topics that are unclear in Sacred Scripture, have yet to be defined, and about which arguments vary. Both the church fathers and the moderns disagreed over some theological questions. The moderns who engage in combative disagreements do not deserve to be called sophists. By their debating, they train their minds, enhance the understanding of Scripture, and contribute to learning. They show that nothing Christians believe is absurd or contradictory of natural reason, but rather is in harmony with it, and can be shown to be true by valid and probable arguments. Some debate matters that are doubtful and patently false in order to prepare and equip themselves to contend with adversaries. If some of the questions treated appear to be thorny, one should remember that from prickly bushes come beautiful roses and delicious berries. Pio conceded that the scholastic method could be abused. Digressions onto questions that have more to do with logic than theology are contrary to the method, which has a disciplined focus requiring definitions and the treatment of specifics. Some questions may seem at first naïve and pointless, but they are in fact very productive and have implications for related important topics. If time and energy are wasted on trifling, inappropriate, and silly questions, this is the fault of poor human judgment, not of the method. Lapses occur in all disciplines. Even Nature at times produces convoluted works mixed with useless and dreadful elements. One needs to separate out from theological discourses and books what is opportune and beneficial from the untimely and trivial. Professors should discuss and dispute in the schools, and not before the general public, which is incapable of understanding these matters. Due to the subtle discourses of theologians, few heresies have arisen over the past five hundred years and those that did were soon refuted and stamped out with little effort.³⁵

Pio responded to Erasmus' complaint against the numerous distinctions made by scholastic theologians. They are not that different from the logical divisions and distinctions used by the earliest church fathers to clarify teachings and eliminate doubts. Teachers of almost all disciplines use distinctions to avoid confusion. Theologians use them to refute claims that Christianity teaches contradictory doctrine. The more subtle questions are usually resolved by making distinctions.³⁶

³⁵ Pio, *XXIII libri*, fols. 78r–79rK–N, 173vM, 176rS.

³⁶ Pio, *XXIII libri*, fols. 78r–vL–M.

Pio claimed that Erasmus' objections to the technical language used by theologians were unjustified.³⁷ All professions and crafts use peculiar terminology not understood by the untrained.³⁸ Hence, it was not surprising then if theologians also had technical terms. Classical Latin did not provide words for their ideas; new words had to be created, just as they are when new things are invented. Cicero himself fashioned new philosophical terms in Latin. Theologians were forced to create new words when treating divine things not generally known, such as the Trinity. The Latin used by the scholastic theologians and philosophers was not classical Latin, but a form of the language debased by interchange with the Goths and Vandals, more barbarous than classical in tone. Even before the barbarian invasions, the Latin language was in a steep decline from the eloquence of the Republican and Augustan ages.³⁹ Theologians are not to be blamed for speaking the language of their contemporaries, for using novel, inelegant, and non-idiomatic Latin expressions.⁴⁰ Their aim was to teach wisdom, not rhetoric. Because they failed to write in a pure Latin style was no reason for rejecting the writings of the great scholastic theologians. Wisdom does not depend on eloquence; indeed, some ancient philosophers viewed rhetoric as something to be avoided, as unworthy of truth. Even the eloquent Plato considered rhetoric a game of youths that debased philosophers. If such is true for philosophers who treat earthly things, how much more so for theologians who deal with the divine? What is important is the meaning of the message, not its style. Language does not determine reality, but reality creates words. It is better for the wise

³⁷ In the *Moriae encomium*, Erasmus has Folly claim that the theologians "abound in newly coined expressions and strange-sounding words." LB IV, col. 462C; ASD IV-3, p. 146, line 394; CWE 27, p. 126.

³⁸ Pio here is echoing the arguments of Cicero who defended the invention of technical philosophical terms, some of which retained the Greek word when no Latin equivalent could be found, and after long usage became naturalized Latin words—see Cicero, *De finibus bonorum et malorum*, ed. H. Rackham (New York/London, 1914), pp. 23 (1.6), 47 (1.12), 219 (3.1), 221 (3.2), 233 (3.4).

³⁹ Pio's views on the decline of the Latin language may reflect in part those of Adriano Castellesi in his *De sermone latino* (1516)—see John F. D'Amico, "The Progress of Renaissance Latin Prose: The Case of Apuleianism," *Renaissance Quarterly* 37 (1984), 351–92, here 379–82, reprinted in his *Roman and German Humanism, 1450–1550: Collected Studies*, ed. Paul F. Grendler (Aldershot, 1993), Study II.

⁴⁰ In *Moriae encomium*, Erasmus has Folly claim that theologians "speak in a specially uncouth and slovenly style... They insist that it detracts from the grandeur of sacred writing if they are obliged to obey the rules of grammar." LB IV, col. 470C; ASD IV-3, p. 158: lines 514–17; CWE 27, p. 130.

man to reveal truths with solecisms, stutterings, and foreign accents, than to remain silent for a lack of eloquence. The students of wisdom have less delicate ears than have the students of rhetoric. Wisdom does not need to be presented in well-turned words. Great wines are still great whether served in earthenware cups or crystal goblets. One should drink wisdom from whatever vessel contains it.⁴¹

A theology based purely on Sacred Scripture has limited usefulness, Pio contended. Many things in the Bible are not important to know and contribute little to the substance of the Faith. The accounts of historical events and the pronouncements of the prophets are examples. While one cannot be a complete theologian in all respects without having read all of the Bible, one can still be a competent theologian if one has carefully grasped its really important points. A biblical theology can inspire the faithful, but it cannot engage unbelievers. Without the assistance of philosophy and the arts, a purely scriptural theology tends to be dull, dense, slow, less robust, and even weak. God can provide by the power of the Holy Spirit an infused and most refined understanding of the most difficult matter, allowing one to discern truth and refute falsehood. But that rarely happens. God wishes that mortals toil with their minds to attain wisdom, and He often assists them with His grace.⁴²

The best form of theology is one that combines Sacred Scripture, philosophy, and the arts. Such was the theology practiced by Saint Paul. In his disputes with the Academics and Stoics at Athens and elsewhere in Greece and Italy, he made use of the commonplaces of philosophy and of the first principles derived from nature. He also made reference to the pagan poets and quoted the Hebrew prophets. His example was followed by the early church fathers. A theologian trained to the highest degree in Scripture, philosophy, and the arts and able to combine them all in his teachings is indeed the consummate theologian.⁴³

According to Pio, Erasmus attacked indiscriminately with insults, libels, and slander the whole profession, class, or genus of theologians. He sought to eliminate all theologians, even those who are innocent and revered both for the dignity of their profession and rectitude of their lives. If that were to happen, heretics would have no one to correct them, church councils would be without expert advice on issues of

⁴¹ Pio, *XXIII libri*, fols. 76v–77vI.

⁴² Pio, *XXIII libri*, fol. 175rQ.

⁴³ Pio, *XXIII libri*, fols. 175rP, 175v–76rR.

faith and religious practice, and the faithful would have no one to warn them against heretics. If theologians carried out their responsibilities with greater care, courage, and freedom today, the Lutheran heretics would not have grown so wanton and abusive.⁴⁴ Pio noted the great irony in Erasmus' efforts to destroy the very group to which he belongs. He was admitted to the guild of theologians not due to his merits but out of their kindness. But then it was a peculiarity of Erasmus' character to be more critical of those whom he has joined.⁴⁵

Erasmus responded to Pio's posthumously published book by attacking his character and rebutting his charges. His colloquy *Exequiae seraphicae* (September 1531) targeted Pio's religiosity manifested in his decision to be buried in the garb of a Franciscan. Erasmus poked fun at the state funeral held in Paris for this exiled prince who was a relative and servant of the French king. The pomp of this ceremony contrasted with the humble rituals of having one's corpse clothed in the simple robe of a friar and carried by fellow friars to their church for burial. Erasmus mocked the Franciscan elements by claiming that Pio's head was tonsured and his uncovered hands and feet and his robe torn at the side to make it appear that he bore the stigmata. Pio's piety had been based on superstition.⁴⁶

Erasmus also attacked Pio's character in the title and index prefacing Erasmus' *Apologia adversus rhapsodias calumniosarum querimoniarum Alberti Pii* published in 1531. He accused him of misunderstandings, exaggerations, distortions, falsifications, lies, calumny, and unreasonable ravings.⁴⁷ He repeated the same charges in his *Brevissima scholia* printed in 1532.⁴⁸ In the *Apologia* he added the charge that out of a desire for literary fame Pio allowed himself to be duped into writing against him despite Pio's lack of qualifications. He was a mere layman, untrained in theology

⁴⁴ Pio, *XXIII libri*, fols. 51r_z, 76rI, 176vV.

⁴⁵ Pio, *XXIII libri*, fol. 176vV. Erasmus was appointed to the theological faculty of the University of Leuven by its rector on 30 August 1517 and was never admitted to its "strict college" of theologians, see Marcel A. Nauwelaerts, "Erasmus à Leuven: Ephémérides d'un séjour de 1517 à 1521," in Joseph Coppens, ed., *Scrinium Erasmianum*, 1 (Leiden, 1969), pp. 3–24, at 7.

⁴⁶ Erasmus, *Exequiae seraphicae*, in ASD I–3, pp. 686–89 / CWE 40, pp. 1000–01.

⁴⁷ Erasmus, *Apologia adversus rhapsodias calumniosarum querimoniarum Alberti Pii quondam Carporum principis, quem et senem et moribundum et ad quidvis potius accommodum homines quidam male auspicati, ad hanc illiberalem fabulam agendam subornarunt*, in LB IX, cols. 1195–96 / CWE 84, pp. 106–09.

⁴⁸ Erasmus, *In elenchum Alberti Pii brevissima scholia*, in CWE 84, pp. 363–85, nrs. 21, 29, 36, 56 (lies), 69 (raving), 47 (slander).

and canon law, weakened by the soft life of court, and dependent on others to do the research, supply him with arguments, and polish up his prose. They even inserted their own material into his work.⁴⁹

Erasmus also answered Pio's specific charges. He admitted that he was not trained in all areas of theology. Nonetheless, what he had written received praise from learned and devout Catholic theologians of the first rank. He had expended much effort to improve the profession of theology, and this proper form of theology based on Sacred Scripture rather than the writings of Aquinas and Scotus was beginning to be taught in European universities.⁵⁰ He was not opposed to the combination of philosophy and theology, but preferred Platonic to Aristotelian philosophy as being more adaptable to Christian theology. The liberal arts should also be applied to theology and allegory used.⁵¹ True theology is based on *pietas* and avoids vain talk. It shows higher regard for the church fathers than for later writers of primers and little *summas*.⁵²

Erasmus found much to fault in scholastic theologians. Some prattle nothing but Aristotle and sophistic nonsense. They are overwhelmed by Aristotelian rules, indulge in frivolous minutiae, waste time on useless, silly, and pernicious questions, and produce human fabrications. They are too disputatious and promote discord. Lacking in humanistic skills, they are unable to interpret Sacred Scripture properly.⁵³ Scholastic theologians such as Thomas Aquinas and John Duns Scotus applied too much philosophy to theology. Folly compared them to cattle and fools. Scotus in particular tends to be overly subtle.⁵⁴ While there are some contemporary theologians whom Erasmus praises by name, there are others he frankly criticizes as corrupters of theology.⁵⁵ According

⁴⁹ Erasmus, *Apologia*, in LB IX, cols. 1123AB, 1123E–24A, 1143A, 1168B, 1169C, 1196B / CWE 84, pp. 110–11, 113, 181, 260, 264, 359.

⁵⁰ Erasmus, *Responsio*, LB IX, col. 1101D (“ego...totius rei theologicae rudis”) / CWE 84, p. 25; idem, *Apologia*, in LB IX, cols. 1127B, 1167C, 1169C / CWE 84, pp. 125, 256, 265.

⁵¹ Erasmus, *Apologia*, in LB IX, cols. 1167A, E, 1168B, C, F / CWE 84, pp. 257–58, 260–61, 263.

⁵² Erasmus, *Apologia*, in LB IX, cols. 1167B, E / CWE 84, pp. 256, 260.

⁵³ Erasmus, *Apologia*, in LB IX, cols. 1138B, 1167C–68A / CWE 84, pp. 165, 256–57, 259.

⁵⁴ Erasmus, *Apologia*, in LB IX, cols. 1167C, E–F, 1168B / CWE 84, pp. 256, 258, 260.

⁵⁵ Erasmus, *Responsio*, in LB IX, cols. 1101D (“tot eximos theologos”); idem, *Apologia*, in LB IX, cols. 1126E–F, 1138C, 1180D–E / CWE 84, pp. 25, 123, 166, 304. In his

to Erasmus, their arrogance and hostility to humanism are a source of the Lutheran disaster. Some theologians claim that Erasmus is in collusion with Luther and they try to drive him into Luther's sect.⁵⁶ Erasmus does not want the destruction of the profession of theologian, but only that they be straightened out.⁵⁷

When Pio's friend and protégé Sepulveda felt obliged to defend his late mentor's reputation from Erasmus' attacks, it is interesting to note that he did not revisit their exchange over scholastic theology.⁵⁸ It was apparently Sepúlveda's judgment that the disagreements between Pio and Erasmus on this topic were essentially minor. Both saw the need for humanistic as well as scholastic theology. Pio had admitted that there were abuses in scholastic theology needing correction and that scholastic theology would be improved if mixed with humanistic studies.⁵⁹ Erasmus did not want the destruction, but rather the reform of scholastic theology so that it became less disputatious and more focused on promoting piety. His appreciation for the skill of the scholastics in dealing with difficult questions was heightened by his finding in the writings of Peter Lombard, Thomas Aquinas, and John Duns Scotus the terminology and distinctions he needed to answer Luther when writing his *Hyperaspistes*. Pio saw the desirability of a scholastic theologian being able to write good Latin and refer to Scripture and the church fathers.

The synthesis of humanistic and scholastic theology was not far away. By the time Melchor Cano (1509–60) wrote his classic *De locis theologicis*, "the premier methodological treatise of early modern Catholic theology...published posthumously in 1563,"⁶⁰ it had become commonly accepted that a theologian should know not only good Latin, but also Greek and Hebrew so as to read the Bible in its original languages. A competent theologian should be able to argue not only from Sacred

Apologia, for example, Erasmus praised Cajetan's acute response to Luther, but claimed Prierias was laughed at by all, see LB IX, 1136A / CWE 84, p. 158.

⁵⁶ Erasmus, *Brevissima scholia*, in CWE 84, p. 374, nr. 55.

⁵⁷ Erasmus, *Apologia*, in LB IX, cols. 1169C-D / CWE 84, pp. 264–65; idem, *Brevissima scholia*, in CWE 84, p. 384, nr. 114.

⁵⁸ On Sepulveda's defense see also above, pp. 73–74.

⁵⁹ Pio, *XXIII libri*, fols. 175vQ, 176r-vS.

⁶⁰ Jared Wicks, "Doctrine and Theology," in John W. O'Malley, ed., *Catholicism in Early Modern History 1500–1700: A Guide to Research* (St. Louis, 1987), pp. 227–53, here p. 234.

Scripture, but also from the church fathers.⁶¹ The divinely inspired scholastic method praised by Pio had been reformed along the lines advocated by Erasmus.

⁶¹ Melchor Cano, *De locis theologicis*, liber VIII, caput iv; IX, i–v; XII, ii–v, in *Melchioris Cani... opera* (Cologne, 1605), pp. 111–19 (I, xv: De linguarum Hebraicae et Graecae utilitate), 384–88 (VIII, iv: Institutores et auctores), 409–19 (IX, i: Ratio naturalis), 551–86 (XII, ii–v: Quid theologia sit, et cetera) e.g. “Qui ergo ad certandum cum fidei adversariis multifformibus, non est etiam multifformi disciplina instructus, is non est dignus, qui in perfectis theologis habeatur. Insuper dividere, inquit voces, quae in scriptura efferuntur ancipites, theologo necessarium erit, ne ex amphibolia et eludat et eludatur. Hoc autem praestare, sine grammaticae artis auxilio non poterit. Quod si grammatica semel admittitur, quid ni dialectica? Quid ni philosophia?... Id quoniam constat esse vanissimum, fateamur necesse est, humanas disciplinas theologo esse perutiles. (IX, v, p. 419).”

EMENDING AND DEFENDING THE VULGATE OLD TESTAMENT: AGOSTINO STEUCO'S QUARREL WITH ERASMUS

Ronald K. Delph

The publication of Agostino Steuco's annotations on the Pentateuch in 1529 by the Aldine Press in Venice marked a major development in humanist Old Testament scholarship. Steuco's annotations represented one of the first systematic attempts by a Renaissance humanist to correct the Latin Vulgate text of the Old Testament *ad Hebraicam veritatem*, according to the Hebrew truth.¹ Steuco's annotations presented a conscious attempt to set out clearly for Old Testament scholars a set of scholarly procedures that they themselves could easily use while emending the Old Testament text. Moreover, he established high standards for annotating and commenting upon the Old Testament text, insisting upon a rigorous philological and historical understanding of the Hebrew.²

What made Steuco's textual emendations particularly valuable and of excellent quality was first and foremost, his solid command of Rabbinical and Old Testament Hebrew, as well as the Latin, Greek, and Aramaic languages.³ Secondly, he had direct access to the Grimani

¹ For contemporary Italian biblical humanists and their reception at the papal court, see the essay by Paul Grendler in this volume above, pp. 227–76.

² References to Steuco's annotations in this study are based upon the *Veteris Testamenti ad veritatem Hebraicam recognitio* (Lyon, 1531). This is by far the best edition of the work I have consulted. The Hebrew in the 1529 Aldine edition lacks the points or vowel markings, and numerous errors plague the 1590/91 Venetian edition of the *Opera omnia*. I have not systematically consulted the edition in the 1577/78 Paris *Opera omnia*. At Deut. 18:21 (p. 718), Steuco wrote of his efforts to emend the Vulgate text based upon a careful collation of the Vulgate with the Hebrew and Greek texts, "In qua re, etsi multa a me fortasse praetermissa sunt, viam saltem caeteris qui in eo laborare voluerint, ostendimus."

³ Steuco (1497–1548) learned Hebrew and Aramaic while studying at the University of Bologna from 1517–1525. During these years Giovanni Flaminio held the chair of Hebrew and Aramaic at the university. Steuco also probably attended the lectures of the humanists Giovan Battista Pio and Romulo Amaseo, both of whom taught rhetoric and poetry at the university in these same years. For Steuco's career, beginning in Gubbio where he was born, up through his ten-year tenure as Vatican Librarian under Paul III from 1538–1548, see Theobald Freudenberger, *Augustinus Steuchus aus Gubbio, Augustinerchorherr und päpstlicher Bibliothekar (1497–1548)* (Münster in Westfalen, 1935); for his student days in Bologna, see esp. pp. 30–36.

Library in Venice, which in the early sixteenth century housed one of the best collections of *Hebraica* and scholarly works on the Old Testament in Europe.

Steuco belonged to the Congregation of Augustinian Canons of San Salvatore of Bologna whose members controlled the monastery of Sant' Antonio in Venice where the Grimani Library was located. In the spring of 1525 Steuco's superiors in the order appointed him custodian in charge of the collection.⁴ Working at the monastery of Sant' Antonio while he composed his annotations, he thus had a wide array of Hebrew and Aramaic manuscripts and early printed works by Jewish authors at his disposal. The most important of these were several manuscripts containing the Hebrew Old Testament text of the Bible.⁵ Another work that he found extremely useful in establishing the *vera lectio* or true reading of the Old Testament was the Targum Onkelos, an Aramaic translation of the text of the Hebrew Pentateuch given final form sometime between the late first and early third century A.D.⁶

He also had on hand a number of commentaries on the Hebrew Old Testament by several medieval Jewish exegetes from which he drew extensively to gain a literal and historical appreciation of the Old Testament text. Of great use to him were the commentaries of Rabbi Solomon or Rashi (1040–1105); Abraham ibn Ezra (1089–1164); David Kimhi (1160–1235); and Moses ben Nahman or Nahmanides (1194–1270).⁷ Additionally the Grimani Library housed the Hebrew

⁴ For Steuco's appointment as custodian of the Grimani Library, see Freudenberger, *Augustinus Steuchus*, pp. 41–43. For Cardinal Domenico Grimani's collection which included many Hebrew and Aramaic works from the library of Pico della Mirandola, see Giovanni Mercati, *Codici Latini Pico Grimani Pio* (Vatican City, 1938), pp. 1–38; Giuliano Tamani, "La Bibliothèque Hébraïque du Cardinal Domenico Grimani," in Georges Vajda, ed., *Actes du XXIX^e Congrès international des orientalistes. Études hébraïques* (Paris, 1975), pp. 10–45; and Theobald Freudenberger, "Die Bibliothek des Kardinals Domenico Grimani," *Historisches Jahrbuch* 56 (1936), 19–23.

⁵ We can ascertain with a fair degree of certainty many of the specific Hebrew authors and works Steuco had at his disposal in the Grimani library from an inventory of Hebrew works owned by Cardinal Grimani. This inventory is found in manuscript form in the Biblioteca Marciana, Venice (hereafter BMV), Classe XIV, 182 (4669), "Index librorum Hebraicorum Rmi. D.D. Dominici Cardinalis Grimani." The inventory lists a total of 193 codices, some containing more than one work. Two manuscript copies of the Hebrew Bible are listed at numbers 1 and 149 (fols. 1r and 10v).

⁶ BMV, Classe XIV, 182 (4669), an Aramaic translation of the Bible is listed at number 139 (fol. 10r).

⁷ BMV, Classe XIV, 182 (4669), Rabbi Solomon's commentary on the Pentateuch is listed at number 139 (fol. 10r). Three copies of Ibn Ezra's commentary on the Pentateuch are listed at numbers 54, 104, 185 (fols. 4v, 8r, 13r). David Kimhi's commentary

lexicons and grammars of several Jewish scholars including those of David Kimhi and Abraham ibn Ezra to which Steuco repeatedly turned for help in clarifying the meanings of obscure Hebrew words or grammatical phrases.⁸

In addition to the plethora of manuscript and printed Hebrew works offered by the Grimani library, Steuco also had access to the great Rabbinical Bible printed by Daniel Bomberg in Venice in 1524/25. Edited by Jacob ben Chayim, this work produced the Massorah, or the numerous textual variants that centuries of Jewish Massoretic scholarship had identified, in the margins alongside the printed Hebrew text. A peculiarity of the Hebrew text made evident by this approach was that frequently the vowel points accompanying a contested word in the text made little or no sense. Rather, they only held linguistic value if applied to the variant in the margin.⁹ While Steuco never directly cited from this work in his annotations, his own scholarship seems to be predicated upon a deep appreciation for what Bomberg's Rabbinical Bible of 1524/25 demonstrated, namely, that the text of the Hebrew Bible was subject to corruption and variants, and that there appeared to be serious scholarly issues surrounding the system of vowel points that accompanied the modern Hebrew text.

Steuco thus had at his command the crucial resources that provided him with the tools to emend Jerome's text and produce helpful annotations to clear up obscure or problematic passages in the Vulgate text. But what really set these annotations apart from anything that had preceded them were the scholarly procedures Steuco followed in using his linguistic skills and textual sources to correct Jerome's text.

Steuco brought to bear on the Vulgate text the innovative scholarly procedures for textual criticism pioneered in Italy by the Venetian humanist Ermolao Barbaro (1453–93) and the Florentine humanist

on Genesis shows up as item number 17 (fol. 2r). The commentaries of Nahmanides on the Pentateuch are catalogued as numbers 36, 127, 164 (fols. 4v, 9v, 11v).

⁸ BMV, Classe XIV, 182 (4669). David Kimhi's grammar is listed twice, at number 23 and 138 (fols. 2v, 10r); while Abraham ibn Ezra's work is noted at number 106 (fol. 8r). Grimani also owned a printed copy of Reuchlin's *De rudimentis Hebraicis* that Steuco used as he wrote his annotation. This work is listed as number 140 (fol. 10r).

⁹ Christian Ginsburg, *Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible* (New York, 1966), pp. 956–972, analyzes Bomberg's Rabbinical Bible of 1524/25. In addition to the Hebrew text and the Massorah for the Pentateuch, this edition also provided the Aramaic text of Onkelos, and the commentaries of Rashi and Ibn Ezra.

Angelo Poliziano (1454–1494).¹⁰ Barbaro and Poliziano insisted that when correcting a faulty text the textual critic should rely upon manuscript evidence for help in uncovering the correct reading of a passage.¹¹ This emphasis upon *emendatio ope codicum* led Barbaro and especially Poliziano, to insist that textual scholars clearly identify the manuscripts they were using, the location of these manuscripts, and the specific authors they cited in making their emendations.¹²

Although they privileged their manuscript evidence, Poliziano and Barbaro recognized that the manuscripts themselves could frequently offer conflicting readings. In such cases they argued that a solid knowledge of the vocabulary, grammar, and writing style of the period could help the textual critic decide what the true reading should be. In addition to this philological analysis, Barbaro and Poliziano demonstrated the usefulness of citing collateral, contemporary sources to help establish word usage and meaning. Both men also helped alert scholars to the most frequent causes of textual corruption. High on the list here was

¹⁰ My thoughts on the scholarship of Barbaro and Poliziano have been shaped by the following works: Anthony Grafton, "On the Scholarship of Politian and Its Context," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 40 (1977), 150–188; idem Joseph Scaliger, *A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1983–93), esp. 1, pp. 10–70; idem, "Quattrocento Humanism and Classical Scholarship," in Albert Rabil, ed., *Renaissance Humanism: Foundations, Forms and Legacy*, 1 (Philadelphia, 1988), pp. 332–49; John D'Amico, *Theory and Practice in Renaissance Textual Criticism. Beatus Rhenanus Between Conjecture and History* (Berkeley, 1988), pp. 8–38; Vittore Branca, "L'umanesimo Veneziano alla fine del Quattrocento. Ermolao Barbaro e il suo circolo," in Girolamo Arnaldi and Manlio Stocchi, eds., *Storia della cultura veneta*, 3, pt. 1 (Vicenza, 1980), pp. 123–75; idem, "Ermolao Barbaro and Late Quattrocento Venetian Humanism," in John R. Hale, ed., *Renaissance Venice* (Totowa, 1973), pp. 218–43; and idem, "Ermolao Barbaro e l'umanesimo veneziano," in Vittore Branca, ed., *Umanesimo europeo e umanesimo veneziano* (Venice, 1963), pp. 193–212.

¹¹ Important precursors to Barbaro and Poliziano in the development of humanist textual criticism were Filippo Beroaldo the Elder, Giovanni Battista Pio, and Giorgio Merula. Beroaldo and Pio taught Latin at the University of Bologna in the early sixteenth-century, while Merula held the chair of Greek and philology at the chancery school of San Marco in Venice from 1468–1485. As mentioned earlier, I strongly suspect that Steuco studied with Pio at the University of Bologna. For Beroaldo, see Ezio Raimondi, *Politica e commedia: dal Beroaldo al Machiavelli* (Bologna, 1972); and Vincenzo Fera, "Polemiche filologiche intorno allo Suetonio del Beroaldo," in A.C. Dionisotti, Anthony Grafton, and Jill Kaye, eds., *The Uses of Greek and Latin* (London, 1988), pp. 71–87. On Pio, see Valerio del Nero, "Note sulla vita di Giovan Battista Pio," *Rinascimento* 21 (1981), 247–63. For Merula see Branca, "Ermolao Barbaro e il suo circolo," pp. 125–27, 158–60. Merula was the teacher of Barbaro in Venice, and according to Branca, kept Lorenzo Valla's philologically oriented textual criticism alive in Venice in the late Quattrocento.

¹² Grafton, "Scholarship of Politian," pp. 159–62, 166; and idem, *Joseph Scaliger*, 1, pp. 23–24.

of course, scribal ineptitude or carelessness. They also recognized that orthographic mistakes and paleographical errors had led to numerous textual corruptions.¹³

Of the two scholars, Poliziano developed the more sophisticated methodology for correcting corrupted texts. For instance, he insisted that an editor look hard at the corruptions within the text, for he believed that the corruptions themselves often held vestiges of the true reading. Poliziano also adopted the practice of carefully leading his readers through the process by which he had arrived at his conjectures. This approach enabled other scholars working on the same text to follow Poliziano's thought process as he settled upon a particular reading. They could then judge for themselves the quality of his conjecture. Poliziano's procedure also allowed him to school other textual scholars in his own methodology.¹⁴

Perhaps most significant of all, Poliziano laid the foundations by which humanists could begin to sort through their various manuscripts and evaluate their worth. He pioneered the concept of grouping his manuscript sources into families and worked to identify, if possible, the *urtext* from which all other manuscripts within that family had come.¹⁵

Steuco probably first encountered this new manuscript based approach to textual criticism when he spent a year in Venice in the house of Augustinian Canons of San Salvatore from April 1521 until May 1522. By this time the influence of Barbaro and Poliziano as textual critics had spread widely among humanists in Venice.¹⁶ Steuco absorbed their principles of textual emendation, and then from 1522–25 he had the opportunity to master these techniques in Bologna, where he taught Latin grammar at the mother cloister of his order. When he returned to Venice as custodian of the Grimani Library at Sant'Antonio in the spring of 1525, he brought with him a solid command of Barbaro's

¹³ Grafton, "Scholarship of Politian," pp. 173–81; idem, *Joseph Scaliger*, 1, pp. 33ff.; idem, "Quattrocento Humanism," pp. 46–48; and Branca, "Ermolao Barbaro e l'umanesimo veneziano," pp. 198–99.

¹⁴ Grafton, "Scholarship of Politian," pp. 151, 165; and idem, *Joseph Scaliger*, 1, p. 27.

¹⁵ Grafton, "Scholarship of Politian," pp. 162, 166–72; idem, *Joseph Scaliger*, 1, pp. 24–25, 29; idem, "Quattrocento Humanism," pp. 35–36; and Branca, "Ermolao Barbaro e il suo circolo," p. 151, esp. note 49.

¹⁶ Freudenberger, *Augustinus Steuchus*, p. 31. In Venice, the chancellery school of San Marco played a crucial role in popularizing the scholarly methodology of Barbaro and Poliziano among Venetian humanists by the early 1520s. See Branca, "Ermolao Barbaro e il suo circolo," pp. 127–30.

and Poliziano's methodology. Throughout his annotations, Steuco closely adhered to the scholarly methodology developed by Barbaro and Poliziano that had its foundation in *emendatio ope codicum*, aided by a judicious use of collateral sources, paleographical analysis, and philological expertise.¹⁷

Following Poliziano's example, Steuco clearly identified the location of the manuscripts and collateral sources he employed in his annotations in the preface to his work. He told his readers that in correcting the Old Testament text and expounding upon its meaning

...we shall offer up passages from the Chaldean [Aramaic] version, frequently we will cite the Hebrew commentators, where they have correctly interpreted the text...indeed the Greek fathers and those ever vigilant holy teachers of sacred scripture are frequently employed, which that exquisite library, built in our monastery by Cardinal Domenico Grimani and his nephew...Marino, also a Cardinal, abundantly supplied to us, having been stocked full of all manner of books...¹⁸

Throughout his annotations Steuco adhered to Poliziano's procedures in handling his manuscript evidence. He generally identified the author of the manuscript or printed work he was following and when using manuscripts containing the Hebrew Old Testament to correct the Vulgate text, he was careful to produce the Hebrew text upon which he based his emendations. Close fidelity to the guidelines that Poliziano had established for handling and citing manuscripts sources made Steuco's emendations extremely useful to other scholars because his manuscript evidence and collateral sources were presented in a clear and orderly fashion. Scholars could judge for themselves the quality of his sources and their authenticity. Moreover, his procedures allowed textual critics to follow easily the steps he had taken in arriving at his corrections or a particular understanding of a word or passage.

A good example of how he used his Hebrew manuscripts and collateral sources to identify errors in the Latin Old Testament text

¹⁷ Freudenberger, *Augustinus Steuchus*, pp. 39–41. For further evidence of Steuco's debt to Barbaro and Poliziano, see my "Valla *Grammaticus*, Agostino Steuco and the Donation of Constantine," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 57 (1996), 60–61.

¹⁸ Steuco, *Veteris Testamenti recognitio*, "Praefatio," pp. 9–10. "Proferemus autem ex Chaldaica editione, locos, Hebraeos interpretes frequenter citabimus, ubi recte fuerint interpretati...Graeci etiam patres, ac pervigiles in sacris litteris hierophantae, non raro adducentur, quorum nobis uberrimam exhibuit copiam divina bibliotheca, quam...Dominicus Grymanus Cardinalis, eiusque ex fratre nepos Marinus et ipse Cardinalis, omni librorum genere refertissimam in aedibus nostris Venetiis crexerunt..."

and suggest emended readings based on the *Hebraica veritas* occurs at Numbers 16:1. Here Jerome's translation, describing the conspiracy of Korah against Moses and Aaron begins

Ecce autem Korah...et Dathan atque Abiram...surrexerunt contra Moses.

[Behold however, Korah...and Dathan and Abiram...rose up against Moses.]

Steuco pointed out that in his Hebrew manuscripts the verse began differently. He observed:

In the Hebrew this beginning starts out in a different fashion, thus

וַיִּקַּח קֹרַח

That is, 'And Korah took,' and the Hebrews understand it as 'he took himself,' that is, 'he was divided from all the host of Israel: because he was preparing to create sedition'.

Not merely content to produce the Hebrew text as he found it in his manuscripts, Steuco proceeded to cite the Aramaic or "Chaldean" text, referring to it by its putative author, Onkelos, and the medieval exegete Rashi, or Rabbi Solomon, as Steuco called him:

...the Chaldean edition, which in obscure places is the greatest aid to the Hebrews, has it thus וַאֲתַפְּלֵג קֹרַח that is, And Korah was apart, and he was separated from them, and he attempted to create a sect loyal to him. Therefore even Rabbi Salomon followed this meaning, and explained it with these words: 'Korah,' he said, 'took.'

לָקַח אֶת עַצְמוֹ לְצַד אֶחָד לְהִיטֵי נַחֲלֵק מִתּוֹךְ הָעֵדָה
לְעוֹרֵר עַל הַכֹּהֲנִים וְזֶה שֶׁתִּרְגֵּם אוֹנְקֵלוֹס וַאֲתַפְּלֵג

Of which words this is the sense: 'He took himself out from the other part, so that he might separate himself from the entire host, and contend concerning the priesthood. This is what Onkelos means when he said, 'And Korah separated himself.' These are Rashi's words. This, then, was the beginning of this chapter, which certainly has been omitted by Jerome.¹⁹

¹⁹ Steuco, *Veteris Testamenti cognitio*, p. 589. "Hoc principium alio modo inchoatur Hebraice sic וַיִּקַּח קֹרַח. Hoc est, Et tulit Chore: subaudiuntque Hebraei tulit seipsum, id est, divisus est a toto coetu Israel: quia seditionem excitare parabat...Chaldaica editio, quae in locis obscuris maximo Hebraeis adiumento est, sic habet וַאֲתַפְּלֵג קֹרַח. Hoc est, Et divisus est Chore. Et separatus est ab aliis, aut sectam sibi peculiarem facere molitus est. Quapropter et Rabbi Salomon, hanc secutus sententiam, his eam verbis explicat. 'tulit inquit Chore

לָקַח אֶת עַצְמוֹ לְצַד אֶחָד לְהִיטֵי נַחֲלֵק מִתּוֹךְ הָעֵדָה
לְעוֹרֵר עַל הַכֹּהֲנִים וְזֶה שֶׁתִּרְגֵּם אוֹנְקֵלוֹס וַאֲתַפְּלֵג

Steuco frequently performed this type of correction where his Hebrew manuscripts allowed him to identify passages that were lacking in the Vulgate, or where Jerome or a careless scribe had added something superfluous to the text.²⁰ This type of textual emendation was fairly straightforward and while it called for a certain level of linguistic capability and familiarity with Hebrew sources, was relatively easy to carry out.

Offering a greater challenge to Steuco's skills as a textual scholar were instances where the translation itself varied from the Hebrew or was unclear. Here Steuco had to employ his philological expertise in the Hebrew language to help establish the true reading of the text. He identified one such thorny passage at Genesis 6:3.²¹ The narrative in Genesis 6:1–2 described mankind descending into sin and corruption just prior to the flood. Then at Genesis 6:3 the Vulgate text read:

Dixit Deus non permanebit spiritus meus in homine in aeternum quia caro est.

[God said my spirit will not remain in man forever because he is flesh.]

The textual problem here revolved around the proper translation of the Hebrew verb יָדֹן (yādôn), which in the Vulgate was rendered *permanebit* or "will remain." Paired with the negative to read "non permanebit" the verb gave to the verse an ominous tone because God was threatening to withdraw his spirit from mankind due to sin. But Steuco pointed out that several of his Hebrew sources gave a far more compassionate reading to this verse, understanding the verb יָדֹן to mean "will judge." In this reading the text ran, "God said, I will not judge man anymore according to his sins."

Quorum verborum is sensus. Tulit, inquit, seipsum Chore ex alia parte, ut ab universo coetu esset abiunctus, et de sacerdotio contenderet. Atque hoc est, quod interpretatus est Onkelos, Et divisus est Chore: haec ille. Quamobrem id erat capitis huius principium, quod certe omissum est a Hieronymo." In Steuco's annotation Rashi's text is printed without the points. They have been supplied from Bamidbar [Numbers], vol. 4 of *Chumash with Targum Onkelos, Haphtaroth, and Rashi's Commentary*, trans. Abraham M. Silbermann (Jerusalem, 1934), p. 77.

²⁰ See the corrections he suggested at *Veteris Testamenti recognitio*, Exodus 38:25–26 (pp. 478–79) and Genesis 17:13 (pp. 248–49), where he supplied texts from his Hebrew manuscripts that were missing in the Vulgate. For examples where he identified passages that were in the Latin text but not the Hebrew, see his annotations for Genesis 20:16 (p. 266) and Genesis 27:33 (p. 287).

²¹ Steuco, *Veteris Testamenti recognitio*, pp. 157–58.

To help his reader decide how the Hebrew text should be rendered, Steuco amassed an impressive array of Hebrew and Aramaic sources. He began his annotation by citing the Hebrew text from his manuscripts: **לֹא-יִדְּוֹן רוּחִי**. Then without citing them by name, he quoted first from Rashi and then from the Spanish Jew Nahmanides (d. 1270), who held conflicting views on the meaning of the verb **יִדְּוֹן**. He writes:

Some say it means my spirit will not judge [Rashi]. Another says it means my spirit will not remain [Nahmanides]. For *neden* [נָדַן] means sheath, from which comes the word *nadan* [נָדַן], to sheath, to put inside, place under, remain, which [meaning] the Septuagint as much as Jerome followed... Others believe it comes from *don* [דָּוַן], that is he judged, and in the future tense *iadon* [יִדְּוֹן], just as it is in this place...²²

Steuco here has laid out the opposing interpretations of the verb **יִדְּוֹן** for his reader, and has also shown how philologically each meaning had merit. He then proceeded to cite several further collateral sources that substantiated each interpretation. He wrote:

The Chaldean version approves the first interpretation) **לֹא-יִתְקַיֵּים דְּרֵא-בִישָׂא** **הַדִּין קֶרְמִי** that is, This evil generation will not exist, will not persist before me. However, Rabbi Isaach wants it to come from the word *don* [דָּוַן], that is, he judged, litigated. And thus we see that different things are pleasing to different people, by which it comes about that both can be accepted.²³

Yet while Steuco acknowledged the ambiguity of the verb **יִדְּוֹן** and agreed that the current Vulgate reading will not remain was acceptable, he harbored a deep suspicion that Jerome's original translation had read will not judge. He wrote:

Be aware that Jerome in his *Quaestiones Hebraicae* did not approve the Septuagint version and he said that in the Hebrew it read *will not judge*, that is, because men are fragile, my spirit will not judge them according to the gravity of their sins. From this I suspect that Jerome had translated it *will not judge*, but from the ancient Latin translation which was based on the Septuagint, *will not remain* was transposed. This I have observed in

²² Steuco, *Veteris Testamenti recognitio*, p. 157.

²³ Steuco, *Veteris Testamenti recognitio*, p. 157. Steuco is citing from Rabbi Isaac Nathan ben Kalonymus' *Meir Netib*, a biblical concordance written c. 1437–47, in which the Hebrew words were arranged according to their roots. The *Meir Netib* was first published in Venice in 1523 by the printing house of Daniel Bomberg.

many places, or certainly it must be said that Jerome thought one thing here and another one there.²⁴

Steuco in this passage has identified a major source of corruption in the Old Testament text. Jerome's own translation, the Vulgate, slowly replaced an earlier Latin translation of the Greek Septuagint known as the *Vetus Latina* version. But as Steuco noted, over the years fragments and phrases from the *Vetus Latina* recension made their way back into the Vulgate text, hence corrupting it. Steuco correctly pointed out that in his *Quaestiones Hebraicae* Jerome had understood יָדַן to mean "will judge", and hence he believed that Jerome had rendered the verb the same way when he later made the Vulgate translation.²⁵

Further evidence of Steuco's skill and sophistication as a textual scholar emerges when we examine his use of paleographical analysis to help unravel the source of corruption in Jerome's translation of the Hebrew into Latin. At Genesis 36:24, the Vulgate text differed from the pointed Hebrew text Steuco was using, and from the interpretation that Rashi had given to the verse in his commentary. Jerome's text read:

Iste est Ana qui invenit aquas calidas in solitudine cum pasceret asinos
[That is Ana who discovered hot springs in the desert when he was tending asses]

Steuco began his annotation by telling his reader that neither Jerome's Vulgate nor the Greek Septuagint followed the Hebrew text in this verse:

One should know that in this place neither Jerome nor the Septuagint agree with the *Hebraica veritas*. Since the Hebrew is read in this fashion: This was the one that discovered יָמַי that is, mules. Indeed the Hebrews say that he, when he was tending asses in the desert, learned how to crossbreed a mule from a horse and donkey... Therefore there is in this place no mention of hot springs, but only something concerning that which was even more miraculous...

He then performed a paleographical examination of the Hebrew text, to reveal for his reader why he believed Jerome had erred:

²⁴ Steuco, *Veteris Testamenti recognitio*, p. 158.

²⁵ Jerome's treatment of this passage is found in Robert Hayward, ed. and trans., *Saint Jerome's Hebrew Questions on Genesis* (Oxford, 1995), pp. 36–37. For a profound analysis of Jerome's *Quaestiones Hebraicae* see Adam Kamesar, *Jerome, Greek Scholarship, and the Hebrew Bible* (Oxford, 1993).

Thus in place of that which now exists in the Hebrew manuscript, יָמִים that is, mules, it seems that in Jerome's times there was either מַיִם, that is waters, or יָמִים that is, seas. And without a doubt יָמִים was read, but because in this time the sacred codices were not marked with points, which among the Hebrews are used in the place of vowels, therefore Jerome thought that this word should be read as יָמִים, seas, not יָמִים that is, mules. And the word which means seas, he translated as hot springs: why he did this is not completely clear. For if he had turned it as only waters, we could have easily understood why he did this, but why he added the word hot, is a puzzle to us. Except that he himself asserted the reason for this translation in his *Quaestiones Hebraicae*, saying that certain men in his time believed that the term hot springs was meant by this word according to the Phoenician language, which is very similar to Hebrew.²⁶

As Steuco recognized in his annotation, the Hebrew texts in Jerome's time were written without the points that denoted the vowels. These points that appear either above, beside, within or below the sacred Hebrew letters were developed and added to the text by Massoretic scholars sometime between the late seventh and early eighth centuries A.D. in Palestine. When the Massoretes added the vowel points to the consonantal text, they removed all ambiguity from words that were spelled identically with the vowels removed.²⁷ The product of their labor, known as the Massoretic text, slowly gained acceptance among Jewish communities throughout Europe and Palestine so that by the late eighth century it was regarded as the *textus receptus*. So thoroughly did the Massoretic text replace all other readings in the Middle Ages that by the Renaissance period, Hebrew and Christian Old Testament exegetes only had Massoretic texts and Hebrew commentaries on the Massoretic text upon which to base their own textual emendations and exegesis.

While making his translations of the Old Testament in the late fourth century, Jerome had relied upon Hebrew manuscripts and the scholarly tradition belonging to the Massoretic school. This meant that for the most part, his text would agree fairly well with the later standardized pointed text that the Massoretes developed in the seventh and eighth centuries. However, modern scholars now realize that within the early Massoretic tradition there were numerous variants and alternate readings

²⁶ Steuco, *Veteris Testamenti recognitio*, pp. 322–25. In Steuco's annotation the last three occurrences of the Hebrew noun יָמִים are printed without the points. I have supplied them in order to render Steuco's paleographic analysis clear.

²⁷ See on this Ginsburg, *Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition*, pp. 444–53.

of problematic passages where ambiguous consonantal words existed. Thus rather than having been deceived by the similarity of letters between two words in the example just cited at Genesis 36:24, Jerome may well have been following a legitimate reading of the consonantal text preserved in a local manuscript and scholarly tradition.

Further complicating an already complex Old Testament manuscript tradition was the fact that the Greek Septuagint translation of the Old Testament, made sometime around 250 B.C. in Egypt, was not based on the Massoretic manuscript tradition. Instead, it represented another oral and written tradition that flourished independently of the tradition that flowed into the Massoretic school. Consequently in literally hundreds of places the Greek Septuagint text differed from the Massoretic Hebrew text. Because Jerome worked from the Massoretic tradition, his translation differed from the Septuagint text time and again.

This complicated manuscript tradition had two significant consequences for Steuco's scholarship. First of all, since he was collating the Vulgate translation with Hebrew manuscripts containing the Massoretic text, he found Jerome's translation overall to be fairly close to what he believed to be the *Hebraica veritas*. The general fidelity of Jerome's text and translation to the Hebrew text, to the Aramaic text, and to the medieval commentaries of Rashi and Ibn Ezra, persuaded him that no new edition of the Old Testament was necessary. Thus he told his reader in his preface that he had decided not to make a fresh translation of the text, because it was unnecessary. Rather, he had only emended the text in certain places or had occasionally cleared up the Latin translation.²⁸

The second consequence of this complicated manuscript tradition on Steuco's Old Testament scholarship was that it mistakenly led him to believe that the Greek Septuagint translation was a highly corrupted text, and far inferior to that of the Latin Vulgate. Thus a major goal of his annotations was to confront his reader with what he believed to be the poor quality of the Septuagint recension of the Old Testament by constantly pointing out where this text deviated from his Hebrew manuscripts.²⁹ But as a good textual scholar in the tradition of Poliziano

²⁸ Steuco, *Veteris Testamenti recognitio*, p. 9.

²⁹ See, e.g. his remarks at *ibid.*, Ex. 33:4 (p. 472), Lev. 1:9 (p. 482), Num. 9:15 (pp. 559–650), Deut. 21:12 (pp. 723–24).

and Barbaro, he also felt obligated to conjecture why so many variants occurred in the Septuagint text.

In an interesting annotation at Genesis 14:7 we see him actually positing the idea that a “corruption” in the Greek text was due to an alternate reading in the Hebrew manuscript from which the Septuagint translators worked. The text here relates the vicissitudes of war between the rulers of Canaan. The Vulgate, following the Massoretic text reads:

Et percusserunt omnem regionem Amalechitarum
[and they smote all the country of the Amalekites]

In the Septuagint however, the text was different:

πάντας τοὺς ἀρχοντας Ἀμαληκ
[all the princes of Amalec]

Steuco began with a paleographical analysis of the Hebrew to uncover why the Septuagint translation did not agree with his Hebrew manuscripts or Jerome’s Vulgate. He wrote:

Consider, I urge you, the variety that is discovered even in the Hebrew manuscripts. For without a doubt the Septuagint translators seemed to have read not שדה [field, country, region], but שרי [kings] with the letter resh [ר]. For as has often been said, there is the greatest similarity between these two letters [ר resh and ד daleth], nor should it be thought that they were so out of their minds that they would mistake one letter for the other, which wouldn’t even happen to young boys. Most certainly then they did not read the word with a daleth but with a resh. I myself marvel at this variety, and this causes me to suspect that many other things throughout the Bible have been altered.³⁰

It is clear from Steuco’s remarks that he recognized the possibility that actual manuscript variants in the Hebrew texts that Jerome and the Septuagint translators used could and did cause conflicting readings between the Latin Vulgate and the Septuagint texts. Yet because he believed that there was only one true Hebrew text, it appeared to him that the Hebrew codices from which the Septuagint translators worked were corrupted. He expressed this opinion in an annotation to Genesis 23:15 where a textual variant occurred between the Septuagint text

³⁰ Steuco, *Veteris Testamenti recognitio*, pp. 228–29. In this annotation both שדה and שרי appear without the points.

and his Hebrew manuscripts, declaring, "Truly the cause of so many discrepancies was because they had different manuscripts."³¹

His own scholarship, together with ecclesiastical, institutional, and spiritual concerns, worked to shape Steuco's belief that Jerome's text was far superior to that of the Septuagint. He was convinced that by abandoning the Greek Septuagint text and its Latin offspring, the *Vetus Latina* text, Jerome had freed the church from numerous errors that had arisen due to a faulty set of Hebrew manuscripts and a bad translation. This gave primacy of place in his mind to Jerome's Old Testament text in the spiritual life of Christians, and in the rituals and ceremonies of the Church.³²

Steuco's scholarship was certainly not without its critics, however, because he had taken unequivocal positions on several issues that were to be at the center of Biblical controversies throughout the sixteenth century. Moreover, he had subjected the sacred text to a rigorous scholarly examination and had not shied away from pointing out numerous errors in the *textus receptus* of the late medieval church. Not surprisingly, Steuco quickly found himself coming under attack from several humanist biblical scholars. Erasmus in particular took issue with his conclusions about the merits of the Old Testament Vulgate text and its authorship.³³

Erasmus rejected one of Steuco's fundamental conclusions, namely, that the Old Testament Vulgate text was closer to the *Hebraica veritas* than was the Septuagint. Moreover, Steuco had openly censured Erasmus by name in his annotations at Genesis 37:2 for preferring what he believed to be an error ridden text and translation over Jerome's reliable Vulgate edition.³⁴

Steuco had further raised Erasmus' ire when, in an annotation at Genesis 1:27 he accused the northern reformer of showing disrespect in his works toward the saints. Erasmus was not tagged by name in this annotation. Instead, Steuco made several specific references to passages from Erasmus' works where he believed the northern human-

³¹ Steuco, *Veteris Testamenti recognitio*, pp. 274–75.

³² At *Veteris Testamenti recognitio*, Gen. 25:18 (p. 283) he wrote, "Atque ita videmus non iniuria novam editionem attentare voluisse Hieronymum: quod multa absurda, pleraque etiam falsa haberentur in editione Septuaginta."

³³ On the debate over Jerome's authorship of the Old Testament Vulgate in the Renaissance, see Eugene Rice, *Saint Jerome in the Renaissance* (Baltimore, 1985), pp. 173–99.

³⁴ Steuco, *Veteris Testamenti recognitio*, Gen. 37:2 (p. 327).

ist had been callous in his treatment of the saints. Steuco particularly singled out Erasmus' biting remarks about Augustine's erudition in his annotation to John 2:20 that accompanied the Latin text he published in his *Novum Instrumentum*. He closed this annotation by lecturing his readers on the need to join piety to learning, for, as he wrote, learning separated from piety was a most pestilent thing.³⁵

In a lengthy, somewhat testy letter written to Steuco from Freiburg in March of 1531, Erasmus challenged Steuco's belief that the Vulgate Old Testament text was superior to the Septuagint translation.³⁶ As he developed his arguments he questioned whether Jerome was even the translator of the Old Testament Vulgate text that the church currently used. Throughout his letter Erasmus also attempted to refute Steuco's charge that he had shown disrespect toward the saints. His strategy here was to demonstrate that it was Steuco's scholarship—not his own—that reeked of impiety.

Erasmus parried Steuco's assertion that the Septuagint was a degenerate text and bad translation by raising the probability that the Greek text was based upon a different set of Hebrew manuscripts than those Jerome had used. Commenting on Steuco's annotation at Genesis 37:2 where Steuco had criticized the Greek text for deviating from Jerome and his Hebrew manuscripts, he wrote, "Now if the Hebrew words are not ambiguous, one has to believe that the Septuagint translators had read something else than we have..."³⁷

To drive home his point that the Old Testament Vulgate text was of doubtful fidelity to the *Hebraica veritas*, Erasmus listed a dozen places (among hundreds) where Steuco had felt it necessary to emend the Vulgate text.³⁸ One such passage he identified was at Exodus 33:13, where Steuco had criticized the Septuagint translators' rendering of this passage, who he opined, "translated it worse than Jerome did."³⁹ Erasmus bristled at Steuco's remark, and pointedly asked him:

...wherefore is it right that what you discovered in a Hebrew manuscript is truer than what Jerome or the Septuagint translators read, especially since here you cite neither a Greek nor a Hebrew author? Indeed not

³⁵ Steuco, *Veteris Testamenti recognitio*, pp. 68–69. Erasmus' annotation can be found in the edition of the New Testament printed in LB VI, p. 350.

³⁶ Erasmus' letter (Ep. 2465) is published in Allen 9, pp. 204–24.

³⁷ Allen 9, p. 217.

³⁸ Allen 9, pp. 221–23.

³⁹ Steuco, *Veteris Testamenti recognitio*, p. 473.

only frequently but sometimes even with little reverence you dissent from the Septuagint.⁴⁰

Erasmus then added an interesting line that revealed why he was not at all ready to jettison the authority of the Septuagint text. Continuing his remarks he observed:

When you do this, do you not openly reject the opinion of Cyprian, Hilary, Augustine, not to mention the Greek commentators, who believed that the Septuagint translators had produced this version for us by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit?⁴¹

Behind this gesture to divine inspiration lay a reminder that the Septuagint text had been the version that the fathers had widely used and commented upon in the early Christian church. Jerome's Vulgate, as both Erasmus and Steuco knew, had slowly begun to replace the Greek Septuagint text and its Latin translation, the *Vetus Latina* text, in the late fourth century in the western church. Erasmus was harkening back to the textual tradition used in the early church, one that flourished for several centuries prior to the appearance of Jerome's Vulgate. As Erasmus' remarks make clear here, he was little better informed concerning the manuscript tradition of the Old Testament text than was Steuco. Rather, his position that the Septuagint text represented a reliable recension and translation of the *Hebraica veritas* rested primarily upon an appeal to tradition and history.

In his annotations Steuco had argued that the numerous prefaces that Jerome wrote to the various books of the Old Testament proved that the text was his. As further proof that Jerome was the author of the Vulgate text, he had cited many passages from Jerome's *Quaestiones Hebraicae* where Jerome had translated the text just as it appeared in the Vulgate text. Nevertheless, Erasmus had remained unconvinced by this evidence. He told Steuco:

It is more probable that the leaders of the church, since Jerome's version was fairly well accepted, had changed certain things translated by him, and restored some others from the *Vetus Latina* translation and the Septuagint. Thus it happened that this melded version remained with us based upon the authority of the church.⁴²

⁴⁰ Allen 9, p. 221.

⁴¹ Allen 9, p. 221.

⁴² Allen 9, p. 208.

Modern biblical scholars agree with Erasmus that the pristine text of Jerome's Vulgate text disappeared long ago and can never be recovered.⁴³ Steuco, despite his careful collation of the text of the Vulgate Pentateuch did not reach this same conclusion, and this reveals a fundamental conservatism in his scholarship. This conservatism was in fact directly at odds with his scholarly methodology and procedures, and created an underlying tension in his annotations, one that Erasmus readily picked up on. In a biting passage, Erasmus brought Steuco face to face with the apparent contradiction that permeated his scholarship:

...how many times do you freely, not to mention acerbically, dissent from such a great man, since you say that by his work the church was liberated from numerous errors? But what sort of liberator is he, who stumbling himself led the church into error? Is he truly a religious interpreter, who in the sacred texts, whose author is that divine spirit, will permit himself to add more than is necessary or to take away what has been established by the holy spirit? Finally, how many times in these things that I have mentioned do you prefer the Septuagint version to Jerome? And you wonder that in some places I prefer to follow the Septuagint rather than our edition?⁴⁴

Steuco replied to Erasmus' letter with one of his own, written in August 1531 from Reggio Emilia, where he served as prior of the monastery of San Marco from the spring of 1529 until the spring of 1533.⁴⁵

One of the major threads that Steuco took up in his letter was the issue of whether or not Jerome's prefaces that accompanied many books of the Old Testament proved that the text was his. In his earlier annotations he had vociferously argued that they did. However Erasmus in his letter had rejected this argument because he believed that many of the prefaces did not appear to correspond to the texts they accompanied.

The book of Job, Erasmus had remarked, bore twin prefaces from the hand of Jerome. Yet as he noted, they both could not possibly be meant for the same text. This lack of compatibility between prefaces and text was proof for Erasmus that Jerome's original translation had

⁴³ See H.F.D. Sparks, "Jerome as Biblical Scholar," in P.R. Ackroyd and C.F. Evans, eds., *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, 1 (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 518–19; and Bleddyn J. Roberts, "The Old Testament: Manuscripts, Text and Versions," in G.W.H. Lampe, ed., *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, 2 (Cambridge, 1989), p. 25.

⁴⁴ Allen 9, p. 223.

⁴⁵ Freudenberger, *Augustinus Steuchus*, pp. 67–71. His letter, dated July 1531, is contained in Allen 9, pp. 289–307.

been heavily tampered with, so that it no longer corresponded to the prefaces.⁴⁶

Addressing the objection that Erasmus had raised, Steuco in his letter sorted out for the Dutch humanist the disparate origins of the two prefaces to Job. According to Jerome in his first preface, he had made two translation of the Book of Job. One came directly from the Hebrew, and another was based upon the Septuagint Greek translation of Job, corrected against the Hebrew.⁴⁷

Steuco pointed out to Erasmus that Jerome had confessed to making a translation of the Old Testament from the Hebrew into Latin. Steuco's own careful collation of the Vulgate text with his Hebrew manuscripts had proven that the Vulgate text that the church currently used derived from the Hebrew. For Steuco, this was further proof that the Vulgate translation was the work of Jerome.⁴⁸

While emending and annotating the Book of Genesis Steuco had frequently cited Jerome's scholarship and translations found in his *Quaestiones Hebraicae* as proof that the Vulgate version of Genesis belonged to Jerome. In his letter to Erasmus, he turned to Jerome's numerous commentaries on the Old Testament prophets as further proof that the Vulgate Old Testament was from Jerome's pen. He asked Erasmus:

Now if one major part of the Bible, that is, all the prophets, manifestly is Jerome's version (for indeed in his commentaries he cites his version from the Hebrew which is the one the church uses today, and he contrasts it to the Septuagint version) how can it be that the remaining books are not from his version, since clearly they are not the Septuagint version?⁴⁹

Steuco also rejected Erasmus' speculation that at some point church leaders had consciously replaced certain passages in the Vulgate with more familiar texts taken from the Septuagint, thus creating a patchwork text.⁵⁰ Abandoning the fanciful idea that a coterie of early church leaders had consciously tampered with Jerome's text, Steuco noted that the more likely source of textual contamination was simple error,

⁴⁶ Allen 9, pp. 207–08.

⁴⁷ Allen 9, p. 293. For Jerome's prefaces to the books of the Old Testament see Kamesar, *Jerome, Greek Scholarship, and the Hebrew Bible*, passim.

⁴⁸ Allen 9, p. 293.

⁴⁹ Allen 9, p. 293.

⁵⁰ Allen 9, p. 293.

that is, careless scribes unintentionally transposing passages from the Septuagint or Vetus Latina version back into the Vulgate.⁵¹

Steuco continued to argue for the integrity of the Vulgate text in another passage where he revisited the issue of a disputed reading that occurred at Genesis 37:2.⁵² In his original annotation he had cited the Hebrew text that read:

וַיְבֵא אֶת־דִּבְתָּם רָעָה אֶל־אָבִי הֶם

[And Joseph reported evil of them unto their father]

Jerome, he noted, had followed the Hebrew fairly closely, turning the text as:

Accusavitque fratros suos apud patrem crimine pessimo

[and he accused his brothers before his father of a most grave crime]

As Steuco pointed out, the Septuagint text differed widely here by having the brothers denounce Joseph before their father, instead of the other way around. To support his contention that the Hebrew text and Jerome retained the correct reading, Steuco cited the late fourth century Antiochene exegete Diodore of Tarsus, who himself had listed the translations of Aquila, Symmachus and the Syrian edition as favoring the text preserved in the Hebrew and followed by Jerome. Closing his annotation he had remarked:

Given these things, I marvel that Erasmus in many places has preferred the Septuagint version to our own, since the *Hebraica veritas* and the Greek interpreters themselves are openly challenged.⁵³

As revealed from his letter, Erasmus did not bear Steuco's criticism in this passage lightly. Thin skinned as always, he took Steuco's remarks as contemptuous.⁵⁴ Moreover, he staunchly defended his use of the Septuagint reading of Genesis 37:2 which he had employed in his *Paraphrase* of Luke 24:27. Here Erasmus had drawn a parallel between Christ, whom the Jews had falsely accused, and Joseph, whom his brothers had falsely accused. For Erasmus, both Joseph and Christ had come

⁵¹ Allen 9, p. 294.

⁵² Steuco, *Veteris Testamenti recognitio*, pp. 325–27.

⁵³ Steuco, *Veteris Testamenti recognitio*, p. 327.

⁵⁴ Allen 9, pp. 216–17.

as an advocate, a proponent, but instead each one had been unjustly denounced.⁵⁵ He told Steuco:

Now if the Hebrew words are not ambiguous, then one must believe that the Septuagint translators read something different than we have. Indeed is it any wonder if anywhere I follow the Septuagint version, since in a number of places the apostles and evangelists do likewise? Finally, do you yourself not infrequently damn that which Jerome has translated and prefer the Septuagint?⁵⁶

In replying to these remarks in his own letter, Steuco reminded Erasmus that by preferring the Septuagint text here, he was not just ignoring the Hebrew text and Jerome, but that he was also flying in the face of the Greek translators and commentators of Holy Scripture.⁵⁷ Driving home his belief that the text represented by his Hebrew manuscripts was the *Hebraica veritas*—the ancient Hebrew truth—and that Jerome had closely followed this, he scolded Erasmus for not adhering to it:

...either not knowing or pretending not to know these things, you not only dissent in your *Paraphrase*, but even more expressly you say in your *Lingua* that what exists [here] in the Septuagint translation is truer than what exists in our edition. However, when you said this, I think you were ignorant of what the Hebrew said.⁵⁸

It is noteworthy that nowhere in his letter does Steuco directly take up the issue of the several manuscript traditions represented by the Septuagint and Massoretic/Vulgate texts. Erasmus had certainly challenged him on this point, but Steuco refused to be drawn into a discussion where the possibility of two ancient, valid textual traditions had to be reckoned with. Instead, as in the passages above, he unequivocally asserted his unshaken belief that the Massoretic text represented the only *Hebraica veritas*—the ancient Hebrew truth. Similarly, he refused to entertain any possibility that the Vulgate Old Testament translation came from the hand of anyone but Jerome.

Steuco's letter to Erasmus reflected the same blend of cutting edge scholarship and conservatism that permeated his annotations. His scholarly approach to Old Testament textual criticism helped put into

⁵⁵ Allen 9, p. 217. The passage in Erasmus' *Paraphrasis in Evangelium Lucae* can be found in LB 7, col. 480E.

⁵⁶ Allen 9, p. 217.

⁵⁷ Allen 9, p. 302.

⁵⁸ Allen 9, p. 302.

place the basic procedures such as *emendatio ope codicum* and the use of paleographical and philological analyses, that would give Old Testament textual emendation a solid, scientific basis once the history of the oral and textual traditions of the Old Testament text was known. But at the same time—and in spite of what his own textual scholarship seemed to reveal—he never ceased believing that the Vulgate Old Testament text was a reliable version of the original Hebrew, nor would he accept anyone but Jerome as the author of this text. The strong pull of tradition and piety upon Steuco led him to draw conclusions from his scholarship that conflicted sharply with those of Erasmus, a humanist with whom he bore a great affinity in terms of his scholarly procedures and the methodology he used when emending and annotation the biblical text.

It is interesting to note that Steuco, one of the pioneers of humanist Old Testament scholarship in the early sixteenth century, had arrived at the same conclusions that many of Erasmus' scholastic opponents such as Maarten van Dorp and Noël Beda had, when evaluating the Vulgate text of the New Testament.⁵⁹ These theologians argued for the integrity of the New Testament text, and had steadfastly held that Jerome had authored the Latin translation.

Erasmus' scholastic opponents in general argued that the Vulgate text had been inspired by the Holy Spirit, and hence any effort on Erasmus' part to correct or replace it with another text was presumptuous.⁶⁰ The Leuven theologian Edward Lee strongly disapproved of Erasmus' biblical scholarship as innovative, and like his colleague Frans Titelmans, argued that tradition must be preserved.⁶¹

To some degree then, both Steuco and these doctors of theology at Leuven and Paris were moved to defend the Vulgate text and Jerome's role as author of that text, out of a sense of piety and a strong reverence for the traditions of the church. But if the Italian humanist and the scholastic theologians shared the same views regarding the reliability of the Vulgate text and Jerome's authorship of that text, they could not have been further apart in their appreciation for the textual

⁵⁹ For Dorp's and Beda's attacks upon Erasmus and their positions on the Vulgate New Testament, see Erika Rummel, *Erasmus and His Catholic Critics* (Nieuwkoop, 1989), passim; eadem, *The Humanist-Scholastic Debate in the Renaissance and Reformation* (Cambridge, MA, 1995), and the essays in this volume by Cecilia Asso and James Farge above, pp. 167–95 and 143–64.

⁶⁰ Rummel, *The Humanist-Scholastic Debate*, pp. 99–100.

⁶¹ Rummel, *The Humanist-Scholastic Debate*, pp. 71, 98.

scholarship that had led Steuco to praise both Jerome as a translator and the integrity of the Vulgate recension of the Old Testament. As revealed in their debates with Erasmus, these scholastic theologians saw no value in the humanists' efforts to work in the original biblical languages and to base their corrections upon the careful collation of ancient manuscripts, or to employ a philologically driven examination of the words in the text.⁶² Thus while scholastic theologians may have approved of Steuco's conclusions, they certainly would not have encouraged his approach to biblical scholarship.⁶³

Steuco's situation in the humanist-scholastic debate illustrates how textured the quarrel over Holy Writ was in the early modern period. Clearly as the reformation heated up, the dichotomy was not merely between humanists and scholastics. And his case should also caution us from assuming that all humanist biblical scholars were ready to replace the Vulgate as the *textus receptus* in the church. Steuco's writings on the Old Testament are not merely dry academic notes, but the vibrant portrayal of a complex mind that worked to reconcile humanist biblical scholarship with a spirituality deeply vested in the traditions and practices of the late medieval church. Whether reading Steuco's annotations or his letter to Erasmus, we see the competing tendencies and complex feelings that pulled at a gifted Catholic humanist scholar who brought his learning and piety to bear on sacred scripture in the tumultuous years of the early sixteenth century.

⁶² Rummel, *Erasmus and His Catholic Critics*, 2, p. 29, and eadem, *The Humanist-Scholastic Debate*, pp. 111, 118.

⁶³ Steuco certainly was no friend of scholastic theologians or their writings. In his *Pro religione christiana adversus Lutheranos* (Bologna, 1530), published in Ambrosius Morandus, ed., *Augustini Steuchi, Opera omnia*, 3 (Venice, 1590/91), fol. 4v, he bitterly attacked the early scholastic opponents of Luther as having written inept replies to the German reformer. Lacking the necessary training in the ancient languages, he observed, they were no match for Luther and his followers in debating theology. At the Council of Trent, his annotations were criticized by Jerome Oleaster, the Dominican theologian of King John III of Portugal. The remarks of Oleaster make it plain that he believed Steuco—a humanist—had written on theological issues in his work, a task for which, in Oleaster's opinion, he had no qualifications. See Freudenberger, *Augustinus Steuchus*, p. 117.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Asensio, Eugenio, "El erasmismo y las corrientes espirituales afines (conversos, franciscanos, italianizantes)." *Revista de Filología Española* 36 (1952): 31–99.
- Ashworth, Jennifer. "Changes in Logic Textbooks from 1500–1650," 75–81. In *Aristotelismus und Renaissance*. Eds. E. Kessler, C.H. Lohr, and W. Sparn. Wiesbaden, 1988.
- Asso, Cecilia. *La Teologia e la grammatica. La controversia tra Erasmo ed Edward Lee*. Florence, 1993.
- . "Erasmo e il battesimo: materiali di lavoro e spunti di riflessione," 255–311. In *Salvezza delle anime e disciplina dei corpi. Un seminario sulla storia del battesimo*. Ed. Adriano Prosperi. Pisa, 2006.
- Avilés Fernández, Miguel. *Erasmo y la Inquisición: El Libelo de Valladolid y la Apología de Erasmo contra los frailes españoles*. Madrid, 1980.
- . "Erasmo y los teólogos españoles," 175–193. In *El erasmismo en España*. Eds. Manuel Revuelta Sañudo and Ciriaco Morón. Santander, 1986.
- Backus, Irena. *Lectures humanistes de Basile de Césarée: traductions latines (1439–1618)*. Paris, 1990.
- . "Renaissance Attitudes to New Testament Apocryphal Writings: Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples and His Epigones." *Renaissance Quarterly* 51 (1998): 1169–98.
- Bataillon, Marcel. *Erasmo y España: estudio sobre la historia espiritual del siglo XVI*. Mexico-Buenos Aires, 1966. French version: *Erasme et l'Espagne*. Geneva, 1991.
- Bedouelle, Guy. *Lefèvre d'Étaples et l'intelligence des Écritures*. Geneva, 1976.
- and Franco Giacomone. "Une lettre de Gilles de Viterbe (1469–1532) à Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples (c. 1460–1532) au sujet de l'affaire Reuchlin." *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 36 (1974): 335–45.
- Bell, Aubrey F.G. *Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda*. Oxford, 1925.
- Bense, Walter. "Noël Beda and the Humanist Reformation at Paris, 1504–1534." Unpublished thesis, Harvard University, 1968.
- . "Noël Beda's View of the Reformation." *Occasional Papers of the American Society for Reformation Research* 1 (December, 1977): 93–107.
- Bentley, Jerry. *Humanists and Holy Writ: New Testament Scholarship in the Renaissance*. Princeton, 1983.
- Bianca, Concetta. "Il pontificato di Niccolò e i Padri della Chiesa," 85–92. In *Umanesimo e padri della Chiesa: manoscritti e incunabili di testi patristici da Francesco Petrarca al primo Cinquecento*. Ed. Sebastiano Gentile. Rome, 1977.
- Bierlaire, Franz. "Le *Libellus Colloquiorum* de mars 1522 et Nicolas Bacchem dit Egmondanus," 55–82. In *Scrinium Erasmianum* 2. Ed. Joseph Coppens. Leiden, 1969.
- Billot, Claude-Charles. *Les Capucins. Une réforme franciscaine au XVI^e siècle*. Nantes, 2001.
- Branca, Vittore. "Ermolao Barbaro and Late Quattrocento Venetian Humanism," 218–43. In *Renaissance Venice*. Ed. John R. Hale. Totowa, 1973.
- . "Ermolao Barbaro e l'umanesimo veneziano," 193–212. In *Umanesimo europeo e umanesimo veneziano*. Ed. Vittore Branca. Venice, 1963.
- . "L'umanesimo Veneziano alla fine del Quattrocento. Ermolao Barbaro e il suo circolo, 123–175. In *Storia della cultura veneta* 3/1. Ed. Arnaldi, Girolamo and Manlio Stocchi. Vicenza, 1980.
- Brod, Max. *Johannes Reuchlin und sein Kampf*. Stuttgart, 1965.
- Camporeale, Salvatore I. *Lorenzo Valla: Umanesimo e teologia*. Florence, 1972.
- Caron, Pierre. *Noël Bédà*. Paris, 2005.

- Carrasco Reija, Leticia, "El género historiográfico de los sumarios en el humanismo español: el *Hispanicarum historiarum breviarum* de Diego López de Zúñiga," 817–827. In *La Filología Latina hoy: actualización y perspectivas*. Ed. Ana María Aldama et al. Madrid, 1999.
- Carraud, Vincent. "Métaphore et sens littéral selon Cajétan," 183–207. In *Rationalisme analogique et humanisme théologique: La culture de Thomas de Vio 'Il Gaetano'*. Eds. Bruno Pinchard and Saverio Ricci. Naples, 1993.
- Cavedoni, Celestino. "Notizia letteraria di alcuni codici orientali e greci dell R. Biblioteca Estense che già furono di Alberto Pio Principe di Carpi." *Memorie di Religiose, di Morale e di Letteratura*, serie III, 17 (1843): 1–19.
- Centi, Timoteo M. "L'attività letteraria di Santi Pagnini (1470–1536) nel campo delle scienze bibliche." *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 15 (1945): 5–51.
- Cevolotto, Aurelio. *Agostino Giustiniani: Un umanista tra Bibbia e Cabala*. Genoa, 1992.
- Chambers, David S. "Studium Urbis and gabella studii: The University of Rome in the Fifteenth Century," 68–110. In *Cultural Aspects of the Italian Renaissance: Essays in Honour of Paul Oskar Kristeller*. Ed. Cecil H. Clough. Manchester, 1976.
- Chastel, André. *Le Mythe de la Renaissance*. Geneva, 1969.
- Chomarat, Jacques. *Grammaire et rhétorique chez Erasme*. Paris, 1981.
- . "Les Annotations de Valla, celles d'Erasmus et la grammaire," 202–28. In *Histoire de l'exégèse au XVI^e siècle: Textes du colloque internationale tenu à Genève en 1976*. Eds. Olivier Fatio and Pierre Fraenkel. Geneva, 1978.
- Codina Mir, Gabriel. *Aux sources de la pédagogie des Jésuites*. Rome, 1968.
- Collins, Thomas Aquinas. "The Cajetan Controversy." *American Ecclesiastical Review* 128 (1953): 90–100.
- . "Cardinal Cajetan's Fundamental Biblical Principles." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 17 (1953): 363–78.
- Coogan, Robert. *Erasmus, Lee and the Correction of the Vulgate: The Shaking of the Foundations*. Geneva, 1992.
- Coppens, Joseph. *Eustachius van Žichem en zijn strijdschrift tegen Erasmus*. Amsterdam, 1974.
- Coroleu, Alejandro, "Il *Democrates primus* di Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda: una nuova prima condanna contro il Machiavelli." *Il Pensiero politico* 25, 2 (1992): 263–68.
- Cortassi, Guido. "Angelo Poliziano: 'Padre nostro'," 395–404. In *Il sacro nel Rinascimento: Atti del XII Convegno internazionale (Chianciano-Pienza, 17–20 luglio 2000)*. Eds. Secchi Tarugi and Luisa Rotondi. Florence, 2002.
- Cortesi, Mariarosa. "Umanisti alla ricerca dei Padri greci," 63–75. In *Umanesimo e padri della Chiesa: manoscritti e incunabili di testi patristici da Francesco Petrarca al primo Cinquecento*. Ed. Sebastiano Gentile. Rome, 1977.
- Crahay, Roland. "Les Censeurs louvanistes d'Erasmus," 221–49. In *Scrinium Erasmianum*. Ed. Joseph Coppens. Leiden, 1969.
- Crane, Mark. "Competing Visions of Christian Reform: Noël Béda and Erasmus." *Erasmus of Rotterdam Society Yearbook* 25 (2005): 39–57.
- D'Alatri, Mariano. *I Cappuccini: storia d'una famiglia francescana*. Rome, 1994.
- D'Amico, John. *Theory and Practice in Renaissance Textual Criticism. Beatus Rhenanus Between Conjecture and History*. Berkeley, 1988.
- . *Renaissance Humanism in Papal Rome: Humanists and Churchmen on the Eve of the Reformation*. Baltimore, 1983.
- . "The Progress of Renaissance Latin Prose: The Case of Apuleianism." *Renaissance Quarterly* 37 (1984): 351–392. Reprinted in *Roman and German Humanism, 1450–1550: Collected Studies*. Ed. Paul F. Grendler. Aldershot, 1993, Study II.
- Daxhelet, Étienne. *Adrien Barlandus humaniste belge 1486–1538. Sa vie—Son Œuvre—Sa Personnalité*. Leuven, 1938.
- Debonnie, Pierre. *Jean Mombaer de Bruxelles, abbé de Livry. Ses écrits et ses réformes*. Leuven, 1928.

- De Jonge, Henk J. "Erasmus and the Comma Johanneum." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 56 (1980): 381–89.
- . "Four Unpublished Letters on Erasmus from J.L. Stunica to Pope Leo X (1520)," 147–60. In *Colloque Erasmi de Liège*, fasc. 247. Ed. Jean-Pierre Massaut. Paris, 1987.
- De Jongh, Henri. *L'Ancienne Faculté de théologie de Leuven au premier siècle de son existence (1432–1540)*. Leuven, 1911.
- Del Nero, Valerio. "Note sulla vita di Giovan Battista Pio." *Rinascimento* 21 (1981): 247–63.
- Delph, Ronald. "Valla *Grammaticus*, Agostino Steuco and the Donation of Constantine." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 57 (1996): 55–77.
- Denifle, Heinrich. "Die Handschriften der Bibel-Correctorien des 13. Jahrhunderts." *Archiv für Literatur- und Kirchen-Geschichte des Mittelalters* 4 (1888): 263–311, 471–601.
- De Petris, Alfonso. "L'*Adversus Judeos et Gentes* di Giannozzo Manetti." *Rinascimento*, ser. II, 16 (1976): 193–205.
- De Vocht, Henry. *History of the Collegium Trilingue Lovaniense*. 4 vols. Louvain, 1951–1955.
- Devreesse, Robert. *Le Fonds grec de la bibliothèque Vatican des origines à Paul V*. Vatican City, 1968.
- Dorati da Ripoli, Maria Cristina. "I lettori dello Studio e i maestri di grammatica a Roma da Sisto IV ad Alessandro VI." *Rassegna degli Archivi di Stato* 40 (1980): 98–147.
- Douglas, Richard, M. *Jacopo Sadoletto 1477–1547: Humanist and Reformer*. Cambridge, Mass., 1959.
- Dröge, Christoph. "Zur Idee der Menschenwürde in Giannozzo Manettis *Protesti di Giustizia*." *Wolfenbütteler Renaissance-Mitteilungen* 14 (1990): 109–23.
- . "The Pope's Favorite Humanist in the Land of the Reformation: On the Reception of the Works of Giannozzo Manetti in Sixteenth-Century Germany and France," 217–24. In *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Bariensis: Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies*. Ed. Rhoda Schnur et al. Tempe, AZ, 1998.
- . *Giannozzo Manetti als Denker und Hebraist*. Frankfurt am Main, 1987.
- . "'Quia morem Hieronymi in transferendo cognovi...': Les débuts des études hébraïques chez les humanistes italiens," 65–88. In Ilana Zinguer, ed., *L'Hebreu au temps de la Renaissance*. Leiden, 1992.
- Eckert, Willehad Paul. "Beatus Simoninus—Aus den Akten des Trienter Judenprozesses," 329–58. In *Judenhass—Schuld der Christen?: Versuch eines Gesprächs*. Eds. W.P. Eckert and E.L. Ehrlich. Essen, 1964.
- Ehres, Stephan. "Eine Denkschrift aus dem Jahre 1530 über Berufung eines Allgemeinen Konzils." *Römische Quartalschrift* 8 (1894): 473–92.
- Engammare, Max. "Qu'il me baise des baisers de sa bouche". *Le Cantique des Cantiques à la Renaissance. Étude et bibliographie*. Geneva, 1993.
- . "Sante Pagnini, traducteur *ad litteram* et exégète *secundum allegoriam* de l'écriture (1520–1536)," 41–52. In *Philologie et subjectivité. Actes de la journée d'étude organisée par l'Ecole nationale des chartes, Paris, 5 avril 2001*. Ed. Dominique de Courcelles. Paris, 2002.
- Etienne, Jacques. *Spiritualisme érasmien et théologiens louvanistes. Un changement de problématique au début du XVI^e siècle*. Leuven, 1965.
- Fanelli, Vittorio. "Il ginnasio greco di Leone X a Roma." *Studi romani* 9 (1961): 379–93.
- Fantazzi, Charles. "Vives' Parisian Writings," 245–70. In *Humanism and Creativity in the Renaissance: Essays in Honor of Ronald G. Witt*. Eds. Christopher Celenzia and Kenneth Gouwens. Leiden, 2006.
- Farge, James K. *Orthodoxy and Reform in Early Reformation France: The Faculty of Theology of the University of Paris, 1500–1543*. Leiden, 1985.

- . *Le parti conservateur au XVI^e siècle. Université et Parlement de Paris à l'époque de la Renaissance et de la Réforme*. Paris, 1992.
- . *Biographical Register of Paris Doctors of Theology, 1500–1536*. Toronto, 1970.
- . “Early Censorship of Printed Books in Paris: New Perspectives and Insights,” 75–91. In *Le contrôle des idées à la Renaissance*. Ed. J.M. de Bujanda. Geneva, 1996.
- . “Les procès de Louis de Berquin: épisodes dans la lutte du Parlement de Paris contre l’absolutisme royal.” *Histoire et Archives* 18 (juillet–septembre 2005): 49–77.
- Feld, Helmut. “Der humanistische Streit um Hebräer 2:7 (Psalm 8:6).” *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 61 (1970): 5–33.
- Fera, Vincenzo. “Polemiche filologiche intorno allo Suetonio del Beroaldo,” 71–87. In *The Uses of Greek and Latin*. Eds. A.C. Dionisotti, Anthony Grafton, Jill Kraye. London, 1988.
- Féret, Pierre-Yves. *La Faculté de théologie de Paris et ses docteurs les plus célèbres. Epoque moderne*. 2 vols. Paris, 1900–10.
- Fernández Marcos, Natalio and Emilia Fernández Tejero. “Biblismo y Erasmismo en la España del siglo XVI,” 97–108. *El Erasmismo en España*. Eds. Manuel Revuelta Sañudo and Ciriaco Morón Arroyo. Santander, 1986.
- Fioravanti, Gianfranco. “Pietro de’ Rossi: Bibbia ed Aristotele nella Siena del ’400.” *Rinascimento*, 2nd ser., 20 (1980): 87–159. Reprinted 55–127 in his *Università e città: Cultura umanistica e cultura scolastica a Siena nel ’400*. Florence, 1981.
- François, Wim. “De onweerlegbare vertolker van de theologie. Johannes Driedo over Schrift, Augustinus en de katholieke traditie (1533),” 427–46. In *Augustiniana Neerlandica. Aspecten van Augustinus’ spiritualiteit en haar doorwerking*. Eds. Paul van Geest and Hans van Oort. Louvain, 2005.
- . “The Plea by the Humanist Petrus Mosellanus for a Knowledge of the Three Biblical Languages. A Louvain Perspective.” *Revue d’Histoire Ecclésiastique* 98 (2003): 438–81.
- Frenz, Thomas. *Die Kanzlei der Päpste der Hochrenaissance (1471–1527)*. Tübingen, 1986.
- Freudenberger, Theobald. *Augustinus Steuchus aus Gubbio, Augustinerchorherr und päpstlicher Bibliothekar (1497–1548)*. Münster, Westfalen, 1935.
- . “Die Bibliothek des Kardinals Domenico Grimani.” *Historisches Jahrbuch* 56 (1936): 19–23.
- Fryde, E. B. *Humanism and Renaissance Historiography*. London, 1983.
- Fubini, Riccardo. *L’Umanesimo italiano e i suoi storici: Origini rinascimentali, critica moderna*. Milan, 2001.
- Galliner, Helmut. “Agathius Guidacerius 1477?–1540: An Early Hebrew Grammarian in Rome and Paris.” *Historia Judaica* 2 (1940): 85–101.
- Garofalo, Sebastiano. “Gli umanisti italiani del secolo XV e la Bibbia.” *Biblica* 27 (1946): 338–75. Also published 38–75 in *La Bibbia e il Concilio di Trento: Conferenze tenute al Pontificio Istituto Biblico nel quarto centenario del Concilio di Trento*. Rome, 1947.
- Gee, John A. *The Life and Works of Thomas Lupset. With a Critical Text of the Original Treatises and the Letters*. New Haven and London, 1928.
- Geiger, Ludwig. *Johannes Reuchlin, sein Leben und sein Werk*. Leipzig, 1871.
- Gesigora, Gerd. *Ein humanistischer Psalmenexeget des 16. Jahrhunderts: Jacopo Sadoletto (1477–1547): Paradigmatische Studien zur Hermeneutik und Psalmenexegese des 16. Jahrhunderts*. Frankfurt am Main, 1997.
- Gielis, Marcel. *Scholastiek en Humanisme. De kritiek van de Leuense theoloog Jacobus Latomus op de Erasmusiaanse theologievorming*. Tilburg, 1994.
- . “L’augustinisme anti-érasmien des premiers controversistes de Louvain, Jacques Latomus et Jean Driedo,” 19–61. In *L’augustinisme à l’ancienne Faculté de Théologie de Louvain*. Ed. Mathijs Lambergts. Louvain, 1994.
- . “Johannes Driedo. Anwalt der Tradition im Streit mit Humanismus und Reformation,” 135–53. In *Theologen des 16. Jahrhunderts. Humanismus—Reformation—Katholische Erneuerung*. Eds. Martin H. Jung and Peter Walter. Darmstadt, 2002.

- Gilly, Carlos. *Spanien und der Basler Buchdruck bis 1600: ein Querschnitt durch die spanische Geistesgeschichte aus der Sicht einer europäischen Buchdruckerstadt*. Basel, 1985.
- Gilmore, Myron P. "Erasmus und Alberto Pio, Prince of Carpi," 299–318. In *Action and Conviction in Early Modern Europe: Essays in Memory of E.H. Harbison*. Eds. Theodore K. Rabb and Jerrold E. Seigel. Princeton, 1969.
- Ginsburg, Christian. *Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible*. New York, 1966.
- Gleason, Elisabeth G. "The Capuchin Order in the sixteenth century." *Greyfriars Review* 16 (2002): 203–26.
- Godet, Marcel. *La congrégation de Montaigu (1490–1580)*. Paris, 1912.
- Goldschmidt, Lazarus. *The Earliest Editions of the Hebrew Bible. With a Treatise on the Oldest Manuscripts of the Bible by Paul Kahle*. New York, 1950.
- González y González, Enrique. *Joan Lúis Vives de la Escolástica al humanismo*. Valencia, 1987.
- and Víctor Gutiérrez. "Los impresores alemanes y la difusión de la obra de Vives en el siglo XVI," 163–81. In *Alemania y México: percepciones mutuas a través de impresos: siglos XVI–XVIII*. Ed. Horst Pietschmann et al. México, 2005.
- Grafton, Anthony. *Joseph Scaliger. A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship*. 2 vols. Oxford, 1983–93.
- . "On the Scholarship of Politian and Its Context." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 40 (1977): 150–188.
- . "Quattrocento Humanism and Classical Scholarship," 332–49. In *Renaissance Humanism: Foundations, Forms and Legacy*, 1. Ed. Albert Rabil. Philadelphia, 1988.
- Graham, Richard H. "Erasmus und Stunica: A Chapter in the History of New Testament Scholarship." *Erasmus of Rotterdam Society Yearbook* 10 (1990): 9–60.
- Grendler, Paul F. *The Universities of the Italian Renaissance*. Baltimore, 2002.
- Guerlac, Rita. *Juan Luis Vives Against the Pseudodialecticians*. Dordrecht, 1979.
- Gunten, A.F. von. "La contribution des 'Hébraux' à l'oeuvre exégétique de Cajétan," 46–83. In *Histoire de l'exégèse au XVI^e siècle*. Eds. Olivier Fatio and Pierre Fraenkel. Geneva, 1978.
- . "Cajétan dans la correspondance d'Erasmus," 297–323. In *Rationalisme analogique et humanisme théologique: La culture de Thomas de Vio 'Il Gaetano'*. Eds. Bruno Pinchard and Saverio Ricci. Naples, 1993.
- Halkin, Leon-Ernest. *Érasme parmi nous*. Paris, 1987.
- Harvey, Margaret. *The English in Rome, 1362–1420: Portrait of an Expatriate Community*. Cambridge, 1999.
- Hasselhoff, Görg K. "Die Drucke einzelner lateinischer Übersetzungen von Werken des Maimonides im 16. Jahrhundert als Beitrag zur Entstehung der modernen Hebraistik: Agostino Giustiniani und Sebastian Münster," 169–88. In *Gottes Sprache in der philologischen Werkstatt. Hebraistik vom 15. bis zum 19. Jahrhundert*. Eds. Giuseppe Veltri and Gerold Necker. Leiden and Boston, 2004.
- Headley, John M. "Gatlinara, Erasmus and the Imperial Configuration of Humanism," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 71 (1980): 64–98.
- Higman, Francis M. *Censorship and the Sorbonne*. Geneva, 1979.
- . *Piety and the People, Religious Printing in French, 1511–1551*. Ipswich, 1996.
- Horst, Ulrich. "Der Streit um die Heilige Schrift zwischen Kardinal Cajetan und Ambrosius Catharinus," 551–77. In *Wahrheit und Verkündigung: Michael Schmaus zum 70. Geburtstag*, 1. Eds. Leo Scheffczyk, Werner Dettloff, and Richard Heinzmann. Munich, 1967.
- Hufstader, Anselm. "Lefèvre d'Étaples and the Magdalen." *Studies in the Renaissance* 16 (1969): 31–60.
- Janz, Denis. "Cajetan: A Thomist Reformer?" *Renaissance and Reformation* 6 (1982): 94–102.

- Jardine, Lisa. *Erasmus Man of Letters: The Construction of Charisma in Print*. Princeton, 1993.
- Jenkins, Robert, C. *Pre-Tridentine Doctrine. A Review of the Commentary on the Scriptures of Thomas De Vio, Cardinal of St. Xystus, commonly called Cardinal Cajetan*. London, 1891.
- Jones, Joseph R. "An Unpublished Lecture of Antonio de Nebrija: The Repetitio quinta of 1508." *Studia Alfortiana* 12 (1972): 311–12.
- Kaegi, Werner. "Hutten und Erasmus: Ihre Freundschaft und ihr Streit." *Historische Vierteljahrsschrift* 22 (1924–1925): 200–78 and 461–514.
- Kahle, Paul. "Zwei durch Humanisten besorgte, dem Papst gewidmete Ausgaben der hebräischen Bibel," 128–50. *Opera minora*. Ed. Paul Kahle. Leiden, 1956.
- Kamesar, Adam. *Jerome, Greek Scholarship, and the Hebrew Bible*. Oxford, 1993.
- King, Margaret L. *Venetian Humanism in an Age of Patrician Dominance*. Princeton, 1986.
- Kinney, Daniel. "More's Letter to Dorp: Remapping the Trivium," *Renaissance Quarterly* 34 (1981): 179–210.
- Krebs, Manfred, ed. *Johannes Reuchlin (1455–1522)*. Repr. Sigmaringen, 1994.
- Krey, Philip D.W. and Lesley Smith, eds. *Nicholas of Lyra: The Senses of Scripture*. Leiden, 2000.
- Kristeller, Paul O. *Marsilio Ficino and His Work after Five Hundred Years*. Florence, 1987.
- Lefebvre, Lucien. *Le Problème de l'incroyance au XVI^e siècle. La religion de Rabelais*, rev. ed. Paris, 1947.
- Lefranc, Abel. *Histoire du Collège de France depuis ses origines jusqu'à la fin du premier Empire*. Paris, 1893.
- . "Les commencements du Collège de France," 27–58. In *Le Collège de France (1530–1930): Livre jubilaire composé à l'occasion de son quatrième centenaire*. Ed. Abel Lefranc. Paris, 1932.
- Le Goff, Jacques. *Les Intellectuels au Moyen Âge*. Paris, 1960.
- Legrand, *Bibliographie hellénique des XV^e et XVI^e siècles* (Paris, 1885–1902; reprint Paris, 1962).
- Leinkauf, Thomas. "Philosophie und Religion bei Marsilio Ficino." *Accademia* 4 (2002): 29–57.
- Leniant, Charles Félix. *La satire en France; ou, La littérature militante au XVI^e siècle*. Paris, 1882.
- Levi della Vida, Giorgio. *Ricerche sulla formazione del più antico fondo dei manoscritti orientali della Biblioteca Vaticana*. Vatican City, 1939.
- Lourdaux, J. "Kartuizers-Moderne Devoten. Een probleem van afhankelijkheid." *Ons Geestelijk Erf* 37, no. 4 (1963): 402–18.
- Luzzi, Giovanni. *Santi Pagnini e la sua traduzione latina della Bibbia*. Torre Pellice, n. d.
- Mack, Peter. *Renaissance Argument. Valla and Agricola in the Traditions of Rhetoric and Dialectic*. Leiden, 1993.
- Massaut, Jean-Pierre. *Critique et Tradition à la veille de la Réforme en France*. Paris, 1974.
- . *Josse Clichove, l'humanisme et la réforme du clergé*. Paris, 1990.
- Matheeußen, Constant. "De omstreden datering van een Leuvense Martens-druk: J.L. Vives Opuscula varia," 285–301. In *Liber amicorum Leon Voet*. Ed. Francine de Nave. Antwerp, 1985.
- McConica, James K. *English Humanists and Reformation Politics under Henry VIII and Edward VI*. Oxford, 1965.
- McKane, William. *Selected Christian Hebraists*. Cambridge, 1989.
- Mercati, Giovanni. "Un salterio greco e una catena greca del salterio posseduti dal Sadoletto," 2: 205–11. In *Miscellanea Pio Paschini: Studi di storia ecclesiastica*. Ed. Facultas Theologica Pontificii Athenaei Lateranensis. Rome, 1949.
- . *Codici Latini Pico Grimani Pio*. Vatican City, 1938.
- Mesnard, Pierre. "Humanisme et théologie dans la controverse entre Erasme et Dorpius." *Filosofia* 14 (1963): 885–900.

- Metzger, Bruce. *The Text of the New Testament. Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*. Oxford, 1968.
- Miglio, Massimo. "Niccolo V umanista di Cristo," 77–83. In *Umanesimo e padri della Chiesa: manoscritti e incunabili di testi patristici da Francesco Petrarca al primo Cinquecento*. Ed Sebastiano Gentile. Rome, 1977.
- Minnich, Nelson, H. "Concepts of Reform Proposed at the Fifth Lateran Council." *Archivum Historiae Pontificiae* 7 (1993): 163–251. This is reprinted with new appendices as Study IV in Nelson Minnich, *The Fifth Lateran Council (1512–17): Studies on its Membership, Diplomacy and Proposals of Reform* (Aldershot, 1993).
- . "Introduction," xv–cxli. In *CWE* 84. Toronto, 2003.
- Monfasani, John, ed. *Collectanea Trapezuntiana: Texts, Documents, and Bibliographies of George of Trebizond*. Binghamton, NY, 1984.
- . *George of Trebizond: A Biography and a Study of His Rhetoric and Logic*. Leiden, 1976.
- . "Erasmus, the Roman Academy, and Ciceronianism: Battista Casali's Invective." *Erasmus of Rotterdam Society Yearbook* 17 (1997): 19–54.
- Moody, Ernest A. *Studies in Medieval Philosophy, Science and Logic*. Berkeley, 1975.
- Moreau, Brigitte. *Inventaire des éditions parisiennes du seizième siècle*. Paris, 1977.
- Morisi, Anna Guerra. "Incontri ebraico-cristiani: Il salterio poliglotta di Santi Pagnini," 9–37. In *Itinerari ebraico-cristiani: società, cultura, mito*. Ed. Anna Guerra Morisi. Fasano, 1987.
- . "Santi Pagnini traducteur de la Bible," 191–98. In *Théorie et pratique de l'exégèse: Actes du troisième colloque international sur l'histoire de l'exégèse biblique au XVI^e siècle (Genève, 31 août–2 septembre 1988)*. Eds. Irena Backus and Francis Higman. Geneva, 1990.
- Moss, Ann. *Renaissance Truth and the Latin Language Turn*. Oxford, 2003.
- Mulè, Cesare. *Agazio Guidacero: un umanista catanzarese a Parigi*. Rome, 1990.
- Muñoz Delgado, Vicente. *Lógica Hispano-Portuguesa hasta 1600*. Salamanca, 1972.
- Murphy, C.M. "An Epistolary Defense of Erasmus: Thomas More and an English Carthusian," 329–47. In *Acta Conventus Neolatini Turonensis*, 2. Ed. Jean-Claude Margolin. Paris, 1980.
- Nauwelaerts, Marcel A. "Erasmus à Louvain: Ephémérides d'un séjour de 1517 à 1521," 13–24. In *Scrinium Erasmusianum*, 1. Ed. Joseph Coppens. Leiden, 1969.
- O'Connor, Michael. "A Neglected Facet of Cardinal Cajetan: Biblical Reform in High Renaissance Rome," 71–94. In *The Bible in the Renaissance: Essays on Biblical Commentary and Translation in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries*. Ed. Richard Griffiths. Aldershot, 2001.
- Olmedo, Felix, G. *Nebrija (1441–1522): debelador de la barbarie, comentador eclesiastico, pedagogo, poeta*. Madrid, 1942.
- O'Malley, John. *Giles of Viterbo on Church and Reform*. Leiden, 1965.
- Paquay, Alfons. *Frans Tittelmans van Hasselt. Opzoekingen over zijn leven, zijne werken en zijne familie*. Hasselt, 1906.
- Payne, John B. "Erasmus and Lefèvre d'Étaples as Interpreters of Paul." *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 65 (1974): 54–83.
- Payne, John P. *Erasmus: His Theology of the Sacraments*. Richmond, 1970.
- Phillips, Margaret Mann. *Erasmus et les débuts de la Réforme française, 1517–1636*. Paris, 1934.
- Polizzotto, Lorenzo. *The Elect Nation: The Savonarolan Movement in Florence 1494–1545*. Oxford, 1994.
- Raimondi, Ezio. *Politica e commedia: dal Beroaldo al Machiavelli*. Bologna, 1972.
- Renaudet, Augustin. *Pré-reforme et humanisme à Paris pendant les premières guerres d'Italie (1494–1517)*. 2nd ed. Paris, 1955.
- . "Jean Standonck, un réformateur catholique avant la Réforme," 114–61. In *Humanisme et Renaissance. Dante, Pétrarque, Standonck, Érasme, Lefèvre d'Étaples, Marguerite de Navarre, Rabelais, Guichardin, Giordano Bruno*. Ed. Augustine Renaudet. Geneva,

1958. Originally published in *Bulletin de la Société de l'histoire du protestantisme français* 57 (1908): 1–81.
- Reusens, Edmond Henri Joseph. *Promotions de la Faculté des Arts de l'Université de Leuven (1428–1797)*. Leuven, 1869.
- Revilla Rico, Manuel. *La Poliglota de Alcalá. Estudio histórico-crítico*. Madrid, 1917.
- Reynolds, David. *In Command of History*. New York, 2005.
- Rice, Eugene F. *The Preparatory Epistles of Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples and Related Texts*. New York, 1972.
- . *Saint Jerome in the Renaissance*. Baltimore-London, 1985.
- . *Studies in Medieval Thought and Learning from Abelard to Wyclif*. London, 1981.
- . "The Humanist Idea of Christian Antiquity. Lefèvre d'Étaples and His Circle." *Studies in the Renaissance* 9 (1962): 126–60.
- Rico, Francisco. *Nebrija frente a los bárbaros: el cánon de gramáticos nefastos en las polémicas del humanismo*. Salamanca, 1978.
- Riessner, C. *Die Magnae Derivationes des Uguccione da Pisa und ihre Bedeutung für die romanische Philologie*. Rome, 1967.
- Ritter, S. *Un umanista teologo Jacopo Sadoletto (1477–1547): In appendice il trattato inedito di Sadoletto De peccato originali*. Rome, 1912.
- Rodriguez-Grahit, I. "Ignace de Loyola et le collège de Montaigu. L'influence de Standonck sur Ignace." *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 20 (1958): 388–401.
- Rummel, Erika. *Erasmus and His Catholic Critics*. Nieuwkoop, 1989.
- . "New Perspectives on the Controversy between Erasmus and Lee." *NAKG* 74 (1994): 226–32.
- . "In Defense of 'Theologizing Humanists': Aurelio Brandolini's 'In Sacram Ebrorum Historiam... Prefatio'." *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 44 (1995): 90–106.
- . *The Case Against Johann Reuchlin: Religious and social Controversy in Sixteenth-Century Germany*. Toronto, 2002.
- . *Erasmus' Annotations on the New Testament: From Philologist to Theologian*. Toronto, 1986.
- . "Why Noël Bede did not like Erasmus' Paraphrases," 265–78. In *Holy Scripture Speaks: The Production and Reception of Erasmus' Paraphrases on the New Testament*. Eds. Hilmar Pabel and Mark Vessey. Toronto, 2002.
- . "Humanists, Jews, and Judaism," 3–31. In *Jews, Judaism, and the Reformation in Sixteenth-Century Germany*. Eds. Dean Phillip Bell and Stephen G. Burnett. Leiden, 2006.
- . *The Humanist-Scholastic Debate in the Renaissance and Reformation*. Cambridge, MA, 1995.
- Rüthing, Heinrich. "Zum Einfluss der Kartäuserstatuten auf die Windesheimer Konstitutionen." *Ons Geestelijk Erf* 59, nos. 2–3 (1985): 197–210.
- Sáenz-Badillos Pérez, Alfonso. *La filología bíblica en los primeros helenistas de Alcalá*. Estella, 1990.
- Sartori, Paolo. "La controversia neotestamentaria tra Frans Titelmans ed Erasmo da Rotterdam (1527–1530 ca.). Linee di sviluppo e contenuti." *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 52 (2003): 77–135.
- . "Tracce dell'opera di Iacobus Latomus nel Prologus apologeticus di Frans Titelmans," 1031–42. In *Margarita amicorum. Studi di cultura europea per Agostino Sottili* 2. Eds. F. Forner, C.M. Monti, and P.G. Schmidt. Milan, 2005.
- Secret, François. *Les kabbalistes chrétiens de la Renaissance*. Paris, 1964.
- . "Les grammaires hebraïques d'Augustinus Justinianus." *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 33 (1963): 269–79.
- . "Les Dominicains et la kabbale chrétienne à la Renaissance." *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 37 (1957): 319–36.
- Simonsohn, Shlomo. *The Apostolic See and the Jews. Documents: 1464–1521*. Toronto, 1990.

- Smalley, Beryl. *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*. Oxford, 1941.
- Stinger, Charles. *Humanism and the Church Fathers: Ambrogio Traversari (1386–1439) and Christian Antiquity in the Italian Renaissance*. Albany, NY, 1977.
- Tamani, Giuliano. “La Bibliothèque Hébraïque du Cardinal Domenico Grimani, 10–45. In *Actes du XXIX^e Congrès international des orientalistes. Études hébraïques*. Ed. Georges Vajda. Paris, 1975.
- Tellechea Idígoras, José Ignacio. *El Arzobispo Carranza y su tiempo*. Madrid, 1968.
- Trinkaus, Charles. “In Our Image and Likeness”: *Humanity and Divinity in Italian Humanist Thought*. 2 vols. Chicago, 1970.
- . “L’Heptaplus di Pico della Mirandola: Compendio tematico e concordanza del suo pensiero,” 105–23. In *Giovanni Pico della Mirandola: Convegno internazionale di studi nel cinquecentesimo anniversario della morte (1494–1994: Mirandola, 4–8 ottobre 1994)*. Ed. Gian Carlo Garfagnini. Florence, 1997. Reprinted as Essay XII in his *Renaissance Transformations of Late Medieval Thought*. Aldershot, 1999.
- Tuillier, André. *Histoire du Collège de France, I: La création, 1530–1560*. Paris, 2006.
- . *Histoire de l’université de Paris et de la Sorbonne*. Paris, 1994.
- Vallese, Giulio. *Erasmus e Reuchlin*. Naples, 1964.
- Van Eijl, Edmond J.M. “De theologische faculteit te Leuven in de XV^e en XVI^e eeuw. Organisatie en opleiding,” 69–153. In *Facultas S. Theologiae Lovaniensis 1432–1797*. Ed. Edmond J.M. van Eijl. Louvain, 1977.
- Veissière, Michel. *L’évêque Guillaume Briçonnet (1470–1534)*. Provins, 1993.
- Veyrin-Forrer, Jeanne. “Simon de Colines, imprimeur de Lefèvre d’Etaples,” 97–117. In *Jacques Lefèvre d’Etaples (1450?–1536), Actes du colloque d’Etaples les 7 et 8 novembre 1992*. Ed. Jean-François Pernot. Paris, 1995.
- Vosté, L.-M. “Cardinalis Caietanus sacrae scripturae interpres,” *Angelicum* 40 (1934): 445–513.
- Wicks, Jared. “Thomism Between Renaissance and Reformation: the Case of Cajetan.” *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 68 (1977): 9–31.
- . “Thomas de Vio Cajetan,” 269–83. In *The Reformation Theologians: An Introduction to Theology in the Early Modern Period*. Ed. Carter Lindberg. Oxford, 2002.
- . “Doctrine and Theology,” 227–53. In *Catholicism in Early Modern History 1500–1700: A Guide to Research*. Ed. John W. O’Malley. St. Louis, 1987.
- Wirszubski, Chaim. “Giovanni Pico’s Book of Job.” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 32 (1969): 171–99.
- Zazzu, G.N. “La glossa al Salmo XX nel Salterio Ottaplo di A. Giustiniani,” 575–82. In *Biblische und judaistische Studien: Festschrift für Paolo Sacchi*. Ed. Angelo Vivian. Frankfurt am Main, 1990.

INDEX

- Abelard, Peter 40
 Abraham ibn Ezra 243, 298–299, 308
 Accolti, Pietro 232
 Adrian VI, Pope 5, 7, 9, 76–77, 201, 204, 210–212, 218, 227, 232, 244–245, 264, 273
 Aegidius of Viterbo See Antonini, Egidio
 Agricola, Rodolphus (Rudolphus) 113, 174
 Agrippa, Heinrich Cornelius 121
 Albert of Brandenburg 208–209
 Alcalá 60–61, 63, 73–75, 79, 83, 85–86, 100, 129, 279
 Alcaraz, Antonio de 86
 Aldridge, Robert 89
 Alfonso the Magnanimous, King 21, 31–32
 Aleandro, Girolamo 207, 209, 278, 280
 Ambrose, Saint 106, 161, 236, 243, 266, 269, 287
 Amsterdam, Alaard of 8, 179, 207
 Antonini, Egidio 124, 232
 Aquila 315
 Aquinas, Thomas 25, 34, 209–210, 213, 259, 263, 278, 293–294
 Aretino, Francesco di Mariotto 17
 Argyropoulos, John 17
 Aristotle 6, 36, 40, 53, 95, 97, 104–107, 109, 111, 117, 138, 157, 211, 257, 286, 288, 293
 Arnobius 266
 Athanasius, Saint 266
 D'Auch, François 244
 Augsburg, Diet of 252, 271–272
 Augustine, Saint 5, 25, 29, 34, 66–67, 90, 100, 106, 125, 128, 161, 172, 236, 243, 249, 266, 268–269, 278, 287, 311–312
 Averroes 157
 Bacon, Francis 113
 Bacon, Roger 18
 Bade, Josse 117, 131–132, 284–285
 Badia, Tommaso 11, 268–270
 Baechem, Nicholaas 8, 179 181, 199–200, 208–213
 Barbaro, Ermolao 1, 12, 91, 117, 242, 299–302, 309
 Barbosa, Arias (Aires) 71, 74
 Barlandus, Hubertus 83
 Barlandus, Adrianus 219
 Barrus, Andrea 278
 Basel 5, 67, 89, 135, 161, 170, 177–179, 184–185, 197–198, 200, 208, 210, 230, 284
 Basil the Great, Saint 17, 20, 243, 266
 Batmanson, John 185
 Beda, Noël 6–7, 9, 12, 121–122, 129, 131–133, 143–164, 182, 186–188, 207, 217–219, 250–251, 317
 Bellay, Jean du 162, 266
 Bembo, Pietro 229, 264
 Bernardino of Siena, Saint 26
 Bérault, Nicolas 94
 Bergen, Hendrik van 216
 Berquin, Louis de 130, 139, 154, 160–161
 Bessarion of Trebizond 21, 29
 Bèze, Theodore 118
 Birago, Lampugnino 17, 20
 Bisanti, Triphon 278
 Bisticci, Vespasiano da 32
 Bladus, Antonius 81
 Blois, Simon du 135
 Bobadilla, Nicolás 163
 Boethius 109
 Bollani, Candiano 36
 Bomberg, Daniel 228, 231–233, 299
 Boussard, Geoffroy 123
 Bracciolini, Poggio 21–22, 28
 Bragmardo, Janotus de 52
 Brandolini, Aurelio Lippo 37
 Brescia, Graziano da 278
 Briart, Jean 169, 178, 181, 199–201
 Brignonnet, Guillaume 118–119, 125, 130, 136, 138, 153
 Bruni, Leonardo 18
 Bucer, Martin 119
 Budé, Guillaume 43–44
 Buscoducensis, Nicolaus 205

- Busleyden, Jérôme 96
 Bussi, Giovanni Andrea 18
 Cajetan, Tommaso de Vio 10–11, 212, 238, 240, 251–263, 265, 270–272, 275–276
 Calvin, John 119
 Cambridge 100, 174
 Campen, Jan van 274
 Cano, Melchor 294
 Capito, Wolfgang 49, 119, 139
 Capreolus, John 269
 Carafa, Oliviero 263
 Caroli, Pierre 130–131, 153
 Carranza de Miranda, Sancho 79–81, 83, 92
 Cartagena, Alfonso de 71
 Carvajal, Bernardino López de 76, 228
 Carvajal, Luis de 5, 90–91
 Casali, Battista 280
 Cascales, Francisco 72
 Cassiodorus 236, 243, 266
 Catarino, Ambrogio See Politi, Lancelloto de'
 Catherine of Aragon 160
 Cervicornus, Eucharis 183
 Chalceopoulus, Athanasius 17
 Charles V 7–8, 73, 76, 83, 89, 92, 168, 185–187, 209, 213, 247, 253, 256
 Chastel, Guillaume 123
 Chetart, Amâtre 215
 Chevallon, Claude 161
 Chrysostom, John, Saint 16–17, 266, 268–269, 287
 Churchill, Winston 255–256
 Cicero, Marcus Tullius 37, 99, 106, 111
 Cisneros, Francisco Jiménez de 4–5, 65, 67–69, 73–75, 129, 279
 Civis, George 125–126
 Clement VII, Pope 10–11, 73, 76–77, 82, 85, 227, 233, 245, 248, 253, 257, 261, 264, 271–274, 280
 Glenardus, Nicolaus 202, 207
 Clichtove, Josse 90–91, 120–122, 125–126, 134, 138–139, 149, 156
 Colet, John 23, 49
 Colines, Simon de 138, 153
 Cologne 45, 50, 52–54, 100, 123, 132, 152, 158, 183, 198, 203–204
 Columbus, Christopher 237
 Coppin, Nicolas 203, 213
 Corner, Marco 228
 Coronel, Pablo 77
 Corte, Peter de 213
 Cousturier, Pierre 6, 9, 122, 132–134, 152, 218–219, 222
 Coverdale, Miles 246
 Cranevelt, Frans van 98
 Crastone, Giovanni 31, 33
 Crocus, Cornelis 207
 Croy, Charles de 205
 Croy, Guillaume de 205
 Croy, Robert de 205
 Crucius, Levinus 207
 Cusa See Nicholas of Cusa
 Cuspinian, Johann 47, 49
 Cyprian, Saint 221, 312
 Cyril of Alexandria, Saint 16
 Damián Zaballos, Cosme 63
 Danès, Pierre 250
 Daniello, Jean 256, 272
 Delft, Gillis van 200
 Deloynes, François 154–155
 Diana 47
 Diego Deza, Fray 65
 Dierckx, Vincent See Theoderici, Vincentius
 Diodore of Tarsus 315
 Dionysius the Areopagite 128, 139
 Dolet, Etienne 135
 Dolz de Castellar, Juan 100, 105
 Donatus, Aelius 70
 Dorp, Martin (Maarten van) 7–8, 94–98, 110, 113, 167–174, 181, 195, 199–201, 204, 317
 Dreyfus, Alfred 39
 Driedo (Driedoens), Johannes 207
 Duiveland, Cornelius van 212
 Dullaert, Jan 108–109
 Du Prat, Antoine 130, 139
 Durandus of St. Pourçain 269
 Eck, Johann 150, 241
 Eguía, Miguel de 84
 Eleanor of Portugal 249
 Encina, Juan del 60
 England 49, 97, 169–170, 174–176, 178, 184–185, 188, 239, 247
 Enríquez, Alonso 86
 Erasmus, Desiderius 1, 3–12, 18, 21–23, 27, 37, 40–54, 63, 68, 71, 73–75, 77–92, 94–101, 105–106, 108, 110, 113, 121, 126–129, 131–134, 137, 139–141, 143–144,

- 147, 152, 154–161, 167–195,
 197–215, 217–218, 220–223,
 237–240, 242, 245–246, 260,
 263, 266–268, 271–273, 276–295,
 310–318
 Escolar, Cristóbal 64
 Essche, Johannes van 205
 Estienne, Henri 109, 117, 120
 Estienne, Robert 246
 Eusebius of Caesarea 236

 Farel, Guillaume 119, 138, 154
 Ferdinand I 185
 Fernández, Alfonso 84–85
 Ficino, Marsilio 34, 50, 117
 Florence 34, 50, 241, 247
 Fisher, John 8, 99, 121–122, 188,
 239
 Florido, Francesco 282, 285
 Fonseca, Alfonso de 57
 Fonseca, Juan de 57
 Foreiro, Francisco 140
 Fort, Juan 99–101, 105, 108
 Foxe, Richard 175–176, 188
 France 4, 6, 10, 39, 44, 118–120, 123,
 136, 143–144, 154, 156, 158, 162,
 164, 187, 187, 228, 248, 250–251,
 264–265, 274, 278
 Francis I 7, 10, 44, 118, 121, 130–131,
 153, 158, 160–163, 186–187, 238,
 248–250, 265, 278, 284
 Froben, Johann 5, 82, 176, 184,
 197–198, 201, 204, 213, 284
 Fregoso, Federigo 268

 Gaigny, Jean de 261
 Galatino, Pietro (Colonna) 19
 Galen 263
 Ganay, Germain de 109
 García de Loaysa y Mendoza,
 Juan 84, 86
 Gattinara, Mercurio 84, 186–188
 Gaza, Theodore 17
 Geneva Bible 246
 Germany 45, 49–50, 53, 100,
 179–180, 183, 185, 251
 Gerson, Jean 151, 168, 206, 212
 Ghiberti, Gian Matteo 212
 Giles of Viterbo *See* Antonini, Egidio
 Giles, Peter 96
 Gil López, Fray 87
 Giustiniani, Agostino 9–10, 19,
 233–240, 258, 266, 275–276, 279
 Gnapheus, Guilielmus 206
 González, Francisco 63
 Goritz, Johann 11, 279
 Gourmont, Gilles 182
 Gouvea, Diogo de 88
 Grandval, Marc de 121
 Grapheus, Cornelius 205
 Gratius, Ortwin 48, 52
 Gregory, Guillaume 217
 Gregory of Nyssa, Saint 16–17, 249
 Gregory the Great, Saint 70
 Grimani, Domenico 45–46, 302
 Grimani, Marino 302
 Gringore, Pierre 134
 Grosseteste, Robert 18
 Guidacerio, Agazio 10, 247–251, 273,
 275
 Guidi, Battista de' 18
 Guillén de Brocar, Arnao
 (Arnaldo Guillermo) 75, 129

 Halewijn, Joris van 140
 Henry VIII 84, 160, 162–163,
 185–186, 247
 Hercules 50, 58
 Hermes 117
 Heytesbury, William 106
 Hezius, Thierry 207, 212
 Hilary of Poitiers 236, 287, 312
 Hildegard of Bingen 117
 Hillen, Michael 181, 183–184
 Hodouart, Philippe 130
 Hoen, Cornelis 206
 Hondebeke, Frederik 206
 Hoogstraten, Jacob 3, 48, 51–52, 203
 Hutten, Ulrich von 13, 49, 52–53,
 180, 183, 208

 Iamblichus 34
 Ignatius of Loyola 163
 Isaac Nathan ben Kalonymus 305
 Isabella of Castile 57, 61
 Isocrates 41
 Italy 1–2, 4, 9–10, 15, 58–59, 73, 76,
 100, 117, 169, 225, 228, 244, 248,
 275, 277–278, 291, 299

 Jacob ben Chayim 299
 Jerome, Saint 5–6, 12, 18, 22, 26–31,
 40, 66–69, 76, 79, 87–88, 90, 106,
 120–121, 124–125, 127, 133, 158,
 161, 169, 172, 221, 230–231,
 234–235, 243, 245–246, 258–259,
 262, 265, 278, 285, 299, 303–318
 Josephus 37

- Kimhi, David 231, 236, 239, 243, 247, 298–299
 Kimhi, Moses 239, 250

 La Sapienza, University of 76
 Lange, Jean 138
 Lascaris, Janus 273–274
 Latomus, Jacobus See Masson, Jacques
 Lax de Sariñena, Gaspar 94, 108–109
 Lazius 49
 Lee, Edward 7–8, 78, 84–85, 90, 92, 152, 167–171, 173–195, 200, 212, 223
 Lee, Joyceue 175
 Lee, Richard 174
 Lee, Wilfrid 182
 Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques 6–7, 9, 23, 31, 44, 75, 109, 117–136, 138–141, 147, 149, 152–154, 156–157, 161, 209, 217–218, 220, 237, 239, 243
 Leipzig 150, 202, 203
 Lelli, Teodoro de' 18
 Leo X, Pope 5, 9–11, 45, 50, 67, 77, 81, 227–228, 232, 237–238, 242–244, 248, 252, 264, 271, 273, 279
 Leonicens, Nicolò 263
 Lernaeon Hydra 58
 Leto, Pomponio 18
 Leuven 7–10, 21, 78, 95–98, 113, 127, 152, 165, 167–169, 174, 176–182, 187, 197–201, 203–205, 207–209, 212–215, 218–220, 222, 238–239, 248, 317
 Liechtenstein, Peter 228
 Lombard, Peter 36, 287, 294
 López Zúñiga, Diego 5–6, 57, 74–83, 90, 92, 129, 132–133, 186, 271, 281
 Louis XII 145, 217, 278
 Louise of Savoy 121
 Louvain See Leuven
 Low Countries See Netherlands
 Luis de León, Fray 68
 Lull, Ramon 117
 Lupset, Thomas 176, 185
 Luther, Martin 3–4, 10–11, 42, 54, 80–82, 120, 122, 130, 132, 137–139, 147, 150, 154, 156–158, 179, 198, 201, 203–206, 208–209, 212–214, 249, 251–252, 255, 266, 271, 280–284, 294
 Lypsius, Martin 175, 177–178
 Lyra See Nicholas of Lyra

 Machiavelli, Niccolò 73
 Maillard, Nicolas 154
 Maimonides, Moses 239
 Mair, John 109
 Maldonado, Juan 84
 Manetti, Giannozzo 2, 15, 19–20, 30–34
 Maniacutia, Nicola (Nicholas) 19, 28–29
 Manrique, Alonso (Alfonso) 85–86, 88–89, 188
 Manuzio, Aldo 278, 280
 Marck, Erard de la 98
 Marineo Siculo, Lucio 59
 Marsilius of Padua 132
 Martens, Dirk 78, 97–98, 113, 127, 181, 197, 200, 204
 Martí, Ramón 19
 Martín V, Pope 167
 Martyr d'Anghiera, Peter 58–59
 Masseeuw, Christiaan 150–151
 Masson, Jacques 8–9, 178, 181–182, 187, 198, 200–208, 212–213, 218–220
 Masurier (Mazurier), Martial 123, 130, 153
 Maximilian I 49–50, 252, 278
 Medici, Cosimo de' 50
 Medici, Lorenzo de' 46
 Melanchthon, Philip 1, 48–49, 132, 207, 272
 Mena, Juan de 60
 Mendoza y Zúñiga, Íñigo de 77
 Menot, Michel 136
 Merlin, Jacques 150–151, 153
 Minerva 58
 Mirandola, Giovanni Pico della 1–2, 4, 19, 33–35, 50, 52, 91, 117, 175, 242, 251, 278–279
 Mithridates, Flavius 35
 Montaigu, Collège de 8–9, 143, 145–146, 148, 187, 201, 207, 215–223
 Montano, Benito Arias 246
 Montesdoca, Juan de 278
 More, Thomas 7–8, 49, 54, 95–97, 100–101, 105, 107, 110, 113, 170, 173–176, 185, 188, 239
 Mosellanus, Petrus 202
 Musuro, Marco 273–274, 278
 Mutianus Rufus, Conradus 49–50

 Nadal, Jerónimo 163
 Nahmanides, Moses 231, 298, 305

- Naples 16, 21, 26, 76, 257
 Navarre, Marguerite de 7, 118–119, 161, 163
 Nazienzen, Gregory 287
 Nebrija, Elio Antonio de 4, 57–71, 75, 78–79
 Nesen, Conrad 180
 Nesen, Wilhelm 179–180, 184
 Nestorius 255
 Netherlands 4, 7, 198–199, 209–211, 228
 Neuenahr, Hermann von 46, 49, 51
 Nicholas of Cusa 21, 118, 123
 Nicholas of Lyra 19, 28, 195, 266
 Nicholas V, Pope 2, 15–17, 21, 26, 31–32
 Núñez de Toledo y Guzmán, Hernán 60, 75, 77

 Ockham, William of 106, 269
 Oecolampadius, Johannes 49, 119, 132, 139, 206
 Oem van Wijngaarden, Floris 210
 Olivar, Pedro (Joan Oliver, Pere) 85
 Olivetan, Robert 246
 Origen 31, 120, 150–151, 154, 236, 243, 266, 287
 Orpheus 34
 Ortega, Juan 63
 Osorio, Diego 89
 Oxford 8, 100, 168, 174–175

 Pace, Richard 176, 185
 Pagnini, Sante (Santi) 10, 19, 238, 240–247, 258, 266, 274–276
 Paradis, Paul 250
 Paris 6–7, 9–12, 44, 79, 88, 90–91, 93–94, 96–101, 108–111, 114–115, 117–118, 120–125, 129–131, 134–135, 137–140, 143, 146–148, 151–152, 154–156, 158, 160–164, 168, 180, 182, 186–188, 201, 207, 215, 217–219, 227, 238–240, 248, 250–251, 254, 261, 263, 267–270, 284, 292, 315
 Paul II, Pope 20, 29
 Paul III, Pope 11, 264, 270
 Paul IV, Pope 140
 Paul of Burgos 19, 28
 Pavia, Battle of 7, 186
 Pérez de Almazán, Miguel 64
 Peter of Spain 102, 104–105, 109, 113, 211
 Petit, Guillaume 123, 154

 Petrarch 1
 Peutinger, Konrad 49
 Pfefferkorn, Johann 45–46, 48, 50, 52, 54
 Pio, Alberto 11–12, 73, 76, 277–295
 Pirckheimer, Willibald 47, 49, 51, 185
 Plantin, Christoph 246
 Platina, Bartolomeo Sacchi 18
 Plato 34, 103, 286, 288, 290
 Pliny, Gaius Caecilius 106
 Politi, Lancelloto de' (Ambrogio Catarino) 11, 262–263
 Poliziano, Angelo 12, 37, 50, 242, 300–302, 308
 Pomponazzi, Pietro 278
 Poncher, Etienne 238
 Porphyry 34
 Porro, Pietro Paolo 234–235
 Prato, Felice da 9, 228–233, 258, 266, 275–276
 Prierias, Silvester Mazzolini 240
 Probst, Jacob 203, 205, 210, 212
 Proclus 35
 Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite 25, 35, 42, 117
 Publilius Syrus 111

 Quentel, Petrus 132, 158
 Quiñones, Francisco de 76, 257
 Quintilian 70–71, 112

 Rabelais, François 143
 Ramus, Petrus 13
 Rashi (Solomon ben Isaac) 231, 235–236, 298, 303, 305–306, 308
 Remigius of Auxerre, Saint 25
 Resch, Konrad 154, 180
 Reuchlin, Johann 3, 6, 11, 45–54, 63–64, 68, 71, 122–126, 132, 148, 189, 275, 279, 283
 Rhenanus, Beatus 123, 206
 Riario, Raffaele 45–46, 49
 Richard of Saint Victor 117
 Robijns, Jan 200
 Roger, Servatius 169–170
 Rome 9–11, 15–16, 18, 21, 25, 29, 33, 58, 73, 75–77, 79, 81, 123–124, 140, 152, 168, 183, 222, 227–228, 232, 238, 241–242, 244, 247–249, 252–253, 256–257, 261, 263–264, 267–268, 270–273, 275, 279–281, 284
 Rosemond, Godschalk 210
 Rossi, Pietro de' 19, 36

- Roussel, Gérard 131, 138–139, 153, 161
 Ruiz de Virués, Alonso 85
 Ruys, Walter 212
 Ruysbroeck, Jan 117

 Sadoletto, Giulio 267
 Sadoletto, Jacopo 10–11, 263–271, 275–276
 Salamanca 57–58, 61–63, 70, 74, 85–86, 90
 Salutati, Coluccio 1
 Samminiato, Giovanni da 1
 Sánchez Ciruelo, Pedro 86
 Sartre, Jean-Paul 39
 Sauli, Bandinello 234, 238
 Savonarola, Girolamo 51, 54, 241, 247
 Scotus, John Duns 106, 157, 209, 278, 293–294
 Sedulius, Caelius 61
 Seneca, Lucius Annaeus 121
 Sepúlveda, Juan Ginés de 73, 76–77, 79, 256–257, 278–279, 282, 294
 Servais, Innocent 205
 Servetus, Michael 26, 246
 Sickingen, Franz von 183
 Simeon ben Iochai 235–236
 Simon of Trent, Blessed 18
 Socrates 47, 103
 Sozzini, Lelio 26
 Spain 4–8, 55, 57–60, 65, 73–74, 76–77, 83–84, 90, 92, 102, 104–105, 109, 113, 131, 152, 186, 188, 232
 Standish, Henry 208–209
 Standonck, Jan 9, 145–146, 150, 201, 215–220, 222
 Steuco, Agostino 11–12, 246, 274, 297–299, 301–318
 Strijroede, Godfried 212
 Strozzi, Tommaso 244
 Stunica See López Zúñiga, Diego
 Suiseth (Swineshead), Richard 106
 Sutor, Petrus See Cousturier, Pierre
 Symmachus 266, 315

 Tapper, Ruard 204
 Taxander, Godefridus Ruysius See Theoderici, Vincentius
 Terence, Publius 93
 Tertullian 206

 Theoderici, Vincentius 8, 179, 181, 186, 209–212
 Theodoret of Cyrus 266
 Thersites 47
 Thibault, Jean 98, 181
 Tifernas, Lilius 16–17
 Titelmans, Frans 8–9, 199, 202, 215, 219–223, 317
 Traversari, Ambrogio 17
 Trebizond, George of 16–17, 21, 28–30
 Trent, Council of 140
 Trivulzio, Agostino 267
 Tübingen 3, 48
 Tunstall, Cuthbert 176
 Tyndale, William 207, 246

 Vadianus, Joachim 49
 Valdés, Alfonso de 83, 87, 187–188
 Valdés, Juan de 83
 Valerio 278
 Valla, Lorenzo 2–4, 9, 15–16, 19–30, 33, 37, 68, 71, 101, 111, 152
 Valladolid 81, 83, 85–86, 88–90, 92, 188
 Vatable, François 250
 Vegio, Maffeo 36–37
 Venice 228, 230–232, 253, 270, 280, 297–299, 301
 Vergara, Juan de 75, 79, 81, 86, 90
 Vesalius, Andreas 263
 Victorines 19
 Vienne, Council of 67
 Vigerio, Marco 123–124, 126
 Vigneron, Jean 205
 Vingle, Pierre de 135, 137
 Vives, Juan Luis 5–6, 93–108, 110–113, 200
 Voes, Hendrik 205
 Volz, Paul 42, 54, 285

 Warham, William 188
 William of Sherwood 104
 Wittenberg 1, 261
 Wolsey, Thomas 188
 Wycliffe, John 132, 146

 Zichem, Eustachius van 213
 Zoilus 47
 Zoroaster 34
 Zwingli, Ulrich 119

Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition

Volumes deal with persons, movements, schools and genres in medieval and early modern Christian life, thought and practice. Written by the foremost specialists in the respective fields, they aim to provide full balanced accounts at an advanced level, as well as synthesis of debate and the state of scholarship in 8-15 substantial chapters. Volumes are in English (contributions from continental scholars are translated). 2-3 volumes of 350-600 pages will be published each year. The series is expected to comprise 20-30 volumes.

1. Schabel, C. (ed.). *Theological Quodlibeta in the Middle Ages*. The Thirteenth Century. 2006. ISBN 978 90 04 12333 5
2. Cox, V. & J.O. Ward (eds.). *The Rhetoric of Cicero in Its Medieval and Early Renaissance Commentary Tradition*. 2006. ISBN 978 90 04 13177 4
3. McGuire, B.P. (ed.). *A Companion to Jean Gerson*. 2006. ISBN 978 90 04 15009 6
4. Levy, I.C. (ed.). *A Companion to John Wyclif*. Late Medieval Theologian. 2006. ISBN 978 90 04 15007 2
5. Swanson, R.N. (ed.). *Promissory Notes on the Treasury of Merits*. Indulgences in Late Medieval Europe. 2006. ISBN 978 90 04 15287 8
6. Stayer, J.M. & J.D. Roth (eds.). *A Companion to Anabaptism and Spiritualism, 1521-1700*. 2006. ISBN 978 90 04 15402 5
7. Schabel, C. (ed.). *Theological Quodlibeta in the Middle Ages*. The Fourteenth Century. 2007. ISBN 978 90 04 16288 4
8. Kirby, T. (ed.). *A Companion to Richard Hooker*. With a Foreword by R. Williams. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 16534 2
9. Rummel, E. (ed.). *Biblical Humanism and Scholasticism in the Age of Erasmus*. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 14573 3
10. Newton, L.A. (ed.). *Medieval Commentaries on Aristotle's Categories*. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 16752 0
11. Kolb, R. (ed.). *Lutheran Ecclesiastical Culture, 1550-1675*. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 16641 7